METHOD IN HISTORY

MACE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/methodinhistory00maceuoft

Educat.
Teach.
M.

OHIO LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY

METHOD IN HISTORY

FOR

TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

BY

WILLIAM H. MACE

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, AND AUTHOR OF
"A WORKING MANUAL OF AMERICAN HISTORY"

"The Law in the Mind and the Thought
In the Thing determine the Method"
— WM. A. JONES

107869
28/1/11

GINN & COMPANY
BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1897
BY WILLIAM H. MACE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

59.11

The Athenæum Press
GINN & COMPANY · PROPRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

PREFATORY NOTE.



This book was not made to order, but grew out of an effort, extending over several years, to justify the study of the Pedagogy of History in a University Normal School. Out of almost daily conferences over the problems of general and special method arose the germs of that masterful work, *The Philosophy of Teaching*, by Prof. Arnold Tompkins, University of Illinois, and of the present volume, "Method in History." It is particularly gratifying to me that this work, in passing through the press, has again had the benefit of Professor Tompkins' deep insight into the problem of teaching. The general principles of the book have had also the great benefit of being reviewed by Superintendent Lewis H. Jones, Cleveland, Ohio, and by President E. Benjamin Andrews, Brown University.

I am deeply indebted to Prof. Cyrus W. Hodgin, Earlham College, not only for friendly encouragement while developing the work, but particularly for generous and valuable service in the criticism of both its form and content. I desire, also, to express my obligation to Prof. Moses Coit

Tyler, Cornell University, for the exceptional privilege of working out a portion of the book in his Historical Seminar, and for his scholarly and sympathetic criticisms. Finally, the work has profited by the careful proof-reading of Mr. Herbert P. Gallinger, Fellow in History, Amherst College.

W. H. M.

Syracuse University, March 10, 1896.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION xi

GENERAL NATURE OF HISTORY.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF HISTORY.

General Character of the Problem 1
Erroneous View of History 2
Ideas of Form and Content in History 3
Continuity and Differentiation 7
Five Great Institutions in History 10
The Five Phases not always Coördinate 14
Organic Unity of Institutional Life 15

PROCESSES INVOLVED IN ORGANIZING HISTORY.

General Nature of Organization 19
Organizing Principle of History 20
Fundamental Processes in Organization 21

THE PROCESS OF INTERPRETATION.

Nature and Kinds.

Definition of Interpretation 21
Interpretation of Events 26

Forms of Thought and Sentiment as Discovered in Interpretation.

Causes 27
Positive and Negative Causes 28
Fundamental and Particular Causes 29
Purpose and Means 34
Immediate and Remote Ends 39

Material Presented for Interpretation.

Second-hand Material 42
Original Material 43

Educational Value of Interpretation. PAGE

Nature of the Question 46
Integration and Unification 46
The Mechanical Historical Whole 47
The Organic Historical Whole 49
Comparison the Basis of Integration 50
Simplification of Historical Knowledge 52
Division and its Uses 52
Interpretation Develops Historical Judgment 56
Emotional Results of Interpretation 58
Ethical Value of Interpretation 60

THE PROCESS OF COÖRDINATION.

Nature of the Process.

Basis of Coördination 64
Theoretical and Practical Need 65
Principle Stated 67
Suggestions as to Application 68

Educational Value of Coördination.

Effects as to Knowledge 74
Power of Judging Contemporaneous Events 75

ORGANIZATION OF THE PERIODS OF AMERICAN HISTORY.

PERIOD OF THE GROWTH OF LOCAL INSTITUTIONS.

THE RELATION OF DISCOVERIES AND EXPLORATIONS TO THIS PERIOD.

Not a Coördinate Phase of Institutional Life 77
True Connection and Rank 78
Non-American History 81

THE PERIOD AS A WHOLE.

What Constitutes a Period 82
Nature of this Period 82
Organizing Idea 84
Phases of the Period 85

DIFFUSION OF RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES.

Why the New Differentiation is Made 86
The Organizing Principle in the Concrete 87

PAGE

Principle Governing New England's Conduct toward English Authority 91

CENTRALIZATION OF RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES.

Nature of this Organizing Idea 93
General Causes of the Movement 94
Economical Aspects 94
Social and Educational Effects 96
How the Principle Worked in Politics and Religion 98
Conclusion 100
Principle Governing Southern Colonists' Attitude toward England 101

THE MIDDLE COLONIES.

Internal Institutional Growth 103
Attitude toward English Authority 104

PERIOD OF THE GROWTH OF UNION.

THE PERIOD AS A WHOLE.

Transition from Isolation to Union 105
Period Proper 107
Organization as a Whole 109
Phases of the Period 111

UNION AGAINST ENGLAND.

Organizes Events from 1760 to 1783 112
Union on Basis of Rights of Englishmen 113
Union on Basis of Rights of Man 118
Organization of Military Events 120

UNION BETWEEN THE STATES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT.

Organizing Idea of Second Half of the Revolution 129
Union on Basis of Sovereignty of the State 132
Union on Basis of Sovereignty of the Nation 135
Process and Material of Organization 137
Limit to the Process of Organizing a Period 140
Result 142

PERIOD OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALITY.

THE PERIOD AS A WHOLE.

General Nature of the Period 145
Phases of the Period 148

NATIONALITY AND DEMOCRACY. PAGE

A PERIOD OF CONFLICT.

Germs of the Conflict 149
Unconscious Progress of National Sentiment 150
Struggle Originates over Domestic Questions 152
Progress of the Conflict over Foreign Relations 158
Rapid Development of Anti-Democratic Sentiment among the Federalists 164
The Triumph of Democracy 166

THE MUTUAL APPROACH OF NATIONALITY AND DEMOCRACY.

General Features of this Phase 170
Purchase of Louisiana 172
English Aggressions 175
Democracy's Efforts at Redress 176
Effects on Progress of Nationality and Democracy 179
War of 1812 as a Product of the National Spirit 180
The War as a Factor in Nationalizing Democracy 185
Significance of the Era of Good Feeling 190

THE FUSION OF NATIONALITY AND DEMOCRACY WORKING OUT ITS RESULTS.

General Significance of this Phase 191
Significance of Jackson's Election 192
Jackson's Rule Interpreted 196
Campaign of 1840 201
Era of National Pride 203

NATIONALITY AND SLAVERY.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONFLICT.

Origin of the Struggle 206
Meaning of the Missouri Struggle 210
Slavery Nullifies the Tariff 211
Meaning of the Movement for Texas 215

THE GROWTH OF SECTIONALIZATION.

Process already Begun 216
Motive and Results of the Mexican War 219
How the Discovery of Gold in California Aided in Sectionalizing the Nation 222
Compromise of 1850 224

PAGE

Kansas-Nebraska Bill 226
Dred Scott Decision 229
Lincoln-Douglas Debate 230
Other Symptoms of the Triumph of Sectionalization 231
Meaning of the Charleston Convention 233
Significance of Secession 236

THE DESTRUCTION OF SLAVERY AND THE TRIUMPH OF THE NATION.

Significance of Slavery's Appeal to Arms 238
Revival of Nationality in the North 240
How the Slavery Question Forced its Way to the Front 241
Significance of the Proclamation of Emancipation 245
Leading Military Events Making Good the Proclamation of Emancipation and the Restoration of the Nation 247
Other Events from the Proclamation to the Close of the War 250
Digging Slavery up by the Roots 252

THE ELEMENTARY PHASES OF HISTORY TEACHING.

THE SENSE PHASE OF HISTORY.

THE GENERAL PROBLEM.

Logical and Chronological Method 255
Nature and Purpose of Sense History 256
The Material for Sense History 260

THE REPRESENTATIVE PHASE OF HISTORY.

THE GENERAL PROBLEM.

Nature and Immediate Purpose 269
The Remote Purpose 273
The Ethical Purpose 274

MATERIAL FOR REPRESENTATIVE HISTORY.

The Starting-point 276
Lines of Transition from the Present to the Past 278
A Background for Colonial Life 280
The Colony and the Institution with which to Begin 280

PAGE

FORMS IN WHICH REPRESENTATIVE MATERIAL MAY BE PRESENTED.

The Story of the Ideal Historical Person 283
The Story of the Real Historical Person 289
The Story Side of the Event 294
Illustrations of Material and Method of Work 298

HISTORY BOOKS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE 309

INTRODUCTION.

I WELL know the danger that argues against wrenching a subject to make it support a preconceived theory. Efforts have been made to avoid this, and thus escape error and reach the truth. However, certain general principles of education have been present from the beginning, and have been either confirmed or modified by the investigation. It is now proposed to indicate the nature of the problem attacked and explain the method of its solution.

To state the matter negatively, the aim has not been to discuss devices and external manipulations in teaching history; the term "method" is not even intended to suggest diagrams, chronological charts, or expedients of like nature. But something far more fundamental has been the aim: the determining factors in method and not the determined — the principal and not the accidental — ones have been sought for and put to work at the problem. Whether diagrams, outlines, maps, and so on are to be used in teaching history cannot be decided by the whim of the teacher or by some current fashion in teaching the subject, but is to be decided, like other questions about devices and expedients, by an appeal to principles.

It has been held in mind that education is an organic process carried on by the coöperation of two forces : mind, with its powers, processes, and products ; and subject, with its real or possible system of principles and facts. No necessity exists here for the discussion of the unsettled problem concerning the identity or non-identity of mind and subject ; it is sufficient to know that in the educative process, conscious or unconscious, there is such a correspondence and coöperation between the two factors that changes are wrought in one of the factors, — mind ; and we often speak of the subject as being changed from crude facts into some sort of system. In any event, the mind of the learner becomes educated — its possibilities made realities — by possessing the thought of the subject.

In the process of learning the mind is conscious of the thing it thinks and not of its own subjective processes. In the process of teaching the learning mind is led and directed in its efforts to come into contact with the content of things. The teaching act involves another act of correspondence and coöperation ; the mind of the teacher and the mind of the learner coöperate in this act; the learner, as before stated, being conscious only of his subject, while the teacher is conscious of the learner's thinking of the subject. The teacher either is or is not directing a mental process. If he is, then his conscious attention must rest upon that process. The subject presents the common ground where the teaching mind and the learning mind meet. The subject itself is the product of a series of mental processes ; it is a sort of mental formula which expresses the experi-

ence of the minds that have wrought it out. In order, therefore, to direct the student mind in its creation of the subject, the teacher must first have analyzed it into its mental processes and products.

The above are fundamental facts of method in teaching.[1] They are some of the determining principles upon which the so-called "methods" of teaching rest. To these must appeal be made in deciding what devices shall be used, questions asked, or directions given. How can a teacher know, for a certainty, what general devices are usable in any subject, without knowing the general forms of activity the subject calls forth? How can a teacher prepare for the work of each day who cannot forecast the thinking and feeling to be aroused?

The above factors are valuable as correctives of experience; they are above experience, for they inhere in the nature of the teaching act. Experience makes mistakes, and therefore is not the only guide, but must itself be guided. Following the experience of others may be mere imitation and make one the slave of forms, while teaching under the guidance of principles gives inspiration and confers freedom.

The analysis of a subject into its mental process not only forms the basis for any rational discussion of the devices to be used in stimulating the learning mind, but such an analysis also forms the true basis for a discussion of the subject's educational value. The platitudes on

[1] The teaching process is fully elaborated and illustrated in Tompkins' *Philosophy of Teaching.*

educational values might well be exchanged for a critical analysis of the processes stimulated and the products created in the learning mind. Such an analysis is best made by observing the mind in the actual and concrete process of working its way through the subject, and the most competent person to make this observation is the competent teacher whose function is to direct this process. The well-equipped public school teacher ought to be better able to make a helpful discussion of educational values in special fields than the superintendent, for he tests general products and results, while she ought to consciously direct processes in particular subjects. The specialist in a Normal School or University ought, also, to be better authority on the problem of method in his field than even the Professor of Methods or the Chair of Pedagogy. If specialists were to turn their attention to the problem of method and educational values in this higher sense, we should ultimately bridge the chasm between our theory and practice; our theory would vitalize our teaching and in return our teaching would exemplify the principles of our theory. This chasm is partly due to the fact that our educational doctrines are obtained from a general study of mind alone, while they ought to be obtained from reducing this general view to a concrete form, or, perhaps better, the general view of mind ought to be approached through the medium of the subject which is mind in its concrete form. In making his preparation for teaching, the student has before him two subjects, apparently very different in every way; he sees little kinship between psychology and grammar.

He usually feels that psychology is a professional subject — a subject which somehow prepares him to teach, while the special subject is non-professional. Normal Schools generally set aside a portion of their work and dignify it by the term "professional," while other work is cheapened by being called academic. In a Normal School the study of language, history, or mathematics ought to be, and can be, made as strictly professional as the study of psychology. In truth the latter, as generally taught, is just as non-professional as Latin or algebra; the only way to render any subject professional is to study its bearing on the process of learning and teaching. The essential nature of geography is just as important a factor in determining the method of learning and teaching geography as is psychology.

The result of this one-sided view — or at best this dual view of professional preparation — is that we have a literature that speaks of applied psychology, as if it were a subject to be learned and then in some way forced upon the subject, — the subject made to fit a scheme that has been prepared beforehand without particularly consulting the subject to be professionalized. The result is that teachers "professionally trained" still continue unable to bridge the chasm between theory and practice.

This imperfect conception of the nature and relations of the factors which must coöperate to determine rational methods of instruction is not confined to the graduates of Normal Schools. In fact, this class of teachers promise to do much toward remedying this evil. It

is the prevailing custom among teachers in secondary and primary schools to look upon the subject they teach as contributing very little to the method of its teaching. The result is to lower the subject — and, worst of all, the work of teaching — in the estimation of the teacher. The subject stands as so much simple and easy matter upon which no special preparation for the recitation is needed. The work ceases to be interesting and sinks into mere drudgery. College graduates, as a rule, take the same low view of work in these schools. They feel that the branches taught even in the best secondary schools present no problem worthy of their metal! There is a problem here worthy of their best endeavors and one that challenges, in point of difficulty, their strongest and keenest powers. They generally do not know where to look for it; it is a pedagogical, and not an academical, problem. This work is written with the confident hope that such a problem will be perceived in the domain of history teaching in the primary and secondary schools.

The ideas briefly stated in the preceding pages have given general direction to this work. The plan has been to look into history and discover there the processes and products that the mind must work out in organizing its facts into a system. Accordingly, the first step analyzes a number of historical facts to discover some of the essential concepts in history, and at the same time allows the facts discovered to indicate something about the general way in which the mind must move in the subject. This is followed by a more detailed inquiry into the general proc-

esses involved in organizing the material of history into the form of a system. In other words, the general processes of interpretation and coördination and subordination are inquired into and illustrated. Under the head of the educational value of interpretation and coördination and subordination the specific intellectual processes and products are indicated and illustrated, and also the emotional and ethical stimulus imparted is pointed out. Next follows an attempt to make more definite the general principles of historical organization, and to show more fully their educational value by looking into the various periods and subperiods of American history. The purpose here is not to organize the periods in detail, but rather to demonstrate the possibility of doing so. With the ideal of historical organization in mind, as these steps aim to create it, the next part of the discussion deals with those preliminary steps that the immature mind of the primary and grammar grades must take in order to prepare the way for the realization of the ideal set forth above. History in its organized or scientific form is an ideal toward which all work in the subject ought to be directed. The teacher in the primary and secondary schools ought to be under the influence of this view of history, and should be consciously influenced by the fact that his work is one step toward this goal.

METHOD IN HISTORY.

THE GENERAL NATURE OF HISTORY

AND THE PROCESSES INVOLVED IN THE ORGANIZATION OF HISTORICAL MATERIAL.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF HISTORY.

The General Character of the Problem. — Two factors unite to produce historical knowledge, — the transforming agent, mind, and the material to be transformed, the facts of history. The explanation of how historical facts become mind, and how mind becomes history, is the explanation of the process of learning history. The relation between these factors is an organic one. Hence, they can be most profitably discussed together. In fact it is mere speculation about historical science to discuss them out of this living relation, and leaves the ordinary teacher possessed of a body of theory and a body of concrete facts which have no power over each other. It is confidently believed that no better way can be found to enable the teacher to bridge the chasm between theory and practice than to exhibit the mind in the concrete process of working its way through history.

There must necessarily be two phases to our investigation: the first will set forth the essential attributes of the material out of which history is constructed and the form which this science will take, thus exhibiting it as a system of ideas, — history reduced to a form of thought; the second will investigate the mental forms and processes that history calls forth, — mind transformed into history, or at least transformed by history.

The first of these phases is the one in which we end with a logical view of history, — the form the subject must finally take in the mature mind. This final view is equally valuable to the teacher in every grade from the primary school to the university. This thought of the subject the university professor must build into the mind of the student, and the primary teacher must hold it in view as the goal for which she is preparing her pupils; it is the ideal, on the side of the subject, that must inspire and beckon both. The discussion of the first phase naturally falls into two parts: one investigating the fundamental attributes of the subject-matter of history, and the other examining the function of these attributes in the process of giving the subject its scientific form. Although each of these sub-phases will have its turn in the discussion, it is not intended to keep them rigidly separate, but, for pedagogical reasons already given, they will be interwoven. Whenever conclusions are reached as to the nature of historical material, their pedagogical implications will generally be noted.

An Erroneous View of History. — One of the most common errors about the nature of history is to regard it as

a "record." It is not a record, at least not more so than any other subject, for it does not deal with the record as such. History is hardly the thing recorded, for it does not deal with events for their own sake, but only so far as they reveal the life of which they are the result. The "record" idea of history is a conception both superficial and harmful, — superficial because it gives the teacher and student no clue to the real nature of the historical problem, and harmful because it both leads to the belief that the book is the subject, and suggests that the proper thing to do is to transfer the record from the book to the pupil's mind by means of verbal memory.[1] After making this brief statement of what history is not, let us go in quest of a conception that is more fundamental, and therefore more helpful; and one, too, that is drawn from a careful analysis of the material of history itself.

The Ideas of Form and Content in History Developed. — The Pilgrims landed in December, 1620; but, as far as we can see, our institutions would not be different if the Pilgrims had landed six months earlier or six months later. The landing was made on Plymouth Rock; but it is difficult to show that this interesting incident has added to the stability of our institutions. They came over in the *Mayflower*. What if it had been the *Speedwell*, a vessel of no mean name? Would this have given America a different destiny? This boatload of precious freight numbered one hundred

[1] This view of the subject leads to assigning lessons in terms of paragraphs and pages; and, what is still worse, the recitation is conducted in the same way.

two souls. What if there had been one hundred or one hundred twenty? Would this difference in numbers have changed our political, religious, and social life? They signed the "Compact" in the cabin of the *Mayflower;* but it could have been signed on land without having had its significance altered. There is one thing in the life of this hardy band, and in the life of the numerous bands that came to New England and elsewhere, that could not have been changed without changing our history. If these early settlers had been animated by a different set of political, religious, and social ideas, the whole character and trend of our institutions would have been altered.

The Declaration of Independence was made in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on July 4, 1776, in the handwriting of Thomas Jefferson, and with the big signature of John Hancock attached. This event is a fact of great significance in the life of our people, but in what does its significance really consist? Is it found in any or all of the incidents named? Many of these, however interesting, seem matters of accident. Could not the Declaration have been made in Carpenters' Hall, on some other day, in the handwriting of some clerk, and have been signed by some other president of the Continental Congress? Would such a variation in these facts have materially affected the course of the Revolution? Could not all of these happenings have been different, and yet the whole of our history have been, in the main, what it has been? But there is a something here without which the superstructure of our institutional life would be entirely different. This vital thing

is the thought expressed in the Declaration, —the political doctrines of the American people, then and now, which it sets forth. This is the historical content of the event and the document we call the Declaration of Independence ; this is its life ; for without these ideas back of it, the event would not have occurred.

The battle of Gettysburg was seen, heard, and felt by its participants. It had a time and a place; there were so many soldiers in line on each side, and these were commanded by certain officers ; so many men were killed and wounded. In short, a hundred interesting incidents connect themselves with this gigantic contest. But did these things constitute the real Gettysburg? Could not most, if not all, of these features have varied and yet the real historical fact have occurred? The ideas and principles that surged in the brains and hearts of the two armies and of the two sections, and without which the physical struggle would not have been, were the true Gettysburg. No ; the student who does not see two sets of political, social, and industrial ideas belch from the opposing cannon and gleam from sword and saber or flash from deadly bayonet misses the permanent and enduring Gettysburg !

If the process of analysis were applied to other events in our history, or to events connected with the life of any people, it would confirm what is already apparent, namely, that there are two sets of facts in history. From this brief analysis, however, the following conclusions may be drawn as to the nature of history and as to the method of its study ;

1. That one set of historical facts is made up of a people's acts and the other of their thoughts and feelings, ideas and emotions, and that these two sets are parallel in time and together in place. This suggests a more intimate connection.

2. That deeds or events are the signs or expressions of a people's thought and feelings. Man thinks and feels, and acts because he thinks and feels. The act, therefore, is adapted to give expression to his state of mind. Hence, the student may read a nation's thought in its events.[1]

3. It may be said that events constitute the outer form of the subject-matter of history, while thoughts, emotions, and so on, constitute the essence or content of history. It follows, then, that the problem of history lies in the mastery of the content, while the events perform the function of means.

4. Events occur, but ideas continue. Events are transient while ideas are enduring. Only ideas recur. The same idea or sentiment may express itself in numberless events of very different characteristics. The event, therefore, is particular, while the idea or sentiment may be viewed as general. It follows that connections and con-

[1] Every subject of study presents these two phases, — form and content. In mathematics we have signs, rules, and formulae; and number, its processes and relations. In language are found words, sentences, and paragraphs; and also thoughts; and so on with other subjects. "The amount of bad teaching growing out of a failure to clearly differentiate form and content is simply appalling." The most common mistake is to exalt form into an end, and degrade content into a means, or permit it to disappear altogether.

tinuity in history must be sought in ideas rather than among events. The full pedagogical significance of this distinction will be seen further on.

5. Primarily, events are effects, while thoughts and feelings are the causes. But a people in the process of acting under the impulse of an idea may modify it very greatly, may intensify or diminish its strength, or may catch new glimpses of its advantage or its disadvantage. In a secondary sense, then, events are causes and ideas are effects. The suggestion here is that the teacher must see to it that students catch the change in public sentiment that comes through action, as well as search for the true cause of events in a preceding state of public sentiment.

Growth in History is under the Laws of Continuity and Differentiation. — It must be apparent from the above conclusions that the problem of how to study and how to teach history can be illuminated by a closer study of what is seen to be the real essence of history, rather than by a study of its outer form. This essence or content is the life of a people, its life of thought and feeling. Thoughts and feelings are forces that tend to realize themselves by growth. They grow in extent by passing from mind to mind. This process may go on until they absorb the attention of the whole people. But such growth is marked by changes in the ideas themselves. The laws under which the content of history develops will appear from the illustrations below.

A long time ago, the English kings called around them their richest nobles to see how much they would give to

carry on government or to prosecute war. This was repeated until it became a right on the part of the lords to grant or refuse aid. After a time, other classes sent representatives to advise the king. The two sets of advisers formed the two houses of parliament, and the people through these representatives managed the government of England. The English colonies carried the idea to America. In early colonial times there was but one set of representatives for purposes of legislation, — men elected to represent the town or county in the colonial legislatures. But before the Revolution, nearly all of the colonies had two sets of representatives. The Revolution called for a third set of delegates to represent the colony in the Continental Congress. The idea of delegated authority has made great strides since that time. Now the ward has its representatives in the common council, the township has its delegates to the commissioners' court, while the county elects men to go to the state legislature, and the states in turn elect two sets of representatives to the national Congress. The idea goes further: it has penetrated religious, educational, and industrial organizations, and seems to furnish a convenient method of conducting any affair in a large way. The complexity of the system is in striking contrast with the simple method of the colonial days or of the still simpler way of early England.

Continuity and differentiation in the content of history are also well illustrated by the development of the idea of toleration in religion. Once Virginia persecuted Baptists and Puritans, while Massachusetts banished Roger Williams

and hanged Quakers ; but even in colonial times, the laws against Quakers were either repealed or not enforced, and the penalties against heresy were greatly reduced. The revolutionary struggle wore off the sharp edges of religious prejudice, so that most of the states recognized religious freedom in their new constitutions. The sentiment of toleration won its way so completely that the Constitution declared the national legal separation of church and state; but religious freedom has not ceased growing after winning a formal and legal recognition of its right; it is now taking on the form of a moral and personal right. The large and increasing number of religious sects at present, compared with the number in colonial days, shows how rapidly differentiation in religious belief has gone on.

Other illustrations of these laws may be found by tracing the development of our public-school system from its colonial germs to its present high degree of complexity, and also by marking the evolution of the crude industrial ways of our early settlers down to the highly developed organism of our own times.[1]

From the above analyses and illustrations the following conclusions may be drawn :

1. That history deals with the life of a people in the process of growth. The content of history is not a dead or fixed thing, but it lives and moves; it is dynamical and not statical.

[1] The importance of clearly understanding these laws justifies large illustration. Each new illustration can be made more helpful by using a different sort of idea from those found in preceding illustrations.

2. A people's life of thought and feeling obeys the law of continuity and of differentiation. The law of continuity means that there are no breaks or leaps in the life of a people. Development may hasten or may slacken, and may seem to cease for a time, but it is always continuous; it always proceeds out of antecedent conditions, and if it be arrested for a time, it begins again at the point where it ended. The operation of continuity makes history a unit, and is the basis of the organization of its facts into a system.

3. The law of differentiation means that the thoughts and feelings of a people take on new form in the process of growth. The new idea or movement, under continuity, bears resemblance to its former self, while under differentiation it is becoming unlike its former self. Continuity retains something of the old, while differentiation brings to it something new. In adding to the content of history, differentiation produces complexity and at the same time gives, in the new difference, the basis for noting progress.[1]

4. That the understanding of history requires the student to take ideas as germs and trace them through all phases of their growth, thus putting continuous and parallel threads of thought through the entire subject. This is a kind of organization, because it puts a similar, though not identical, content into remote and very diversified events.

Five Lines of Growth and Five Great Institutions in History. — Not only do certain lines of thought develop in obedience to the laws of continuity and differentiation,

[1] The constant recurrence, through their application, of the points under "2" and "3" makes their further illustration unnecessary.

but the life of the race, as a whole, grows in the same way. An examination of the life of any people will reveal certain permanent features common to the history of all civilized nations. There will be found five well-marked phases, — a political, a religious, an educational, an industrial, and a social phase. These are further differentiated by the fact that each has a great organization, called an institution, around which it clusters, and whose purpose, plan of work, and machinery are peculiar to itself. For political ideas the center is the institution called government; for religious ideas, the church; for educational and culture influences, the school; for industrial life, occupation; and for social customs, the family. But there was a time when these elements of life were not so fully differentiated. The primitive history of all peoples shows that, in the beginning, institutional life presented itself to man's consciousness as a simple and undivided whole. Abraham did not separate in thought his political from his religious duties; nor did he think of his business and social interests as different and disconnected. In his day there were only the germs of a government, a church, and a school; and these were so interwoven with other interests that they constituted one great life. But between then and now the principle of differentiation has done its work so perfectly that we often think of the government without the church coming into mind, and so with the other institutions. These institutions have become great crystallized centers of life around which the thoughts and feelings of a people grow.

Growth becomes permanent by being embodied, through law or custom, in its appropriate institution. Growth in political thought and feeling finds entrance into government ; public sentiment, under the pressure of war, abolished slavery in this country, and the result was written in our constitution ; the rise of political parties has added many new customs to our method of president-making. A movement in religious sentiment may ultimately embody itself in church, creed, or custom. The admission of women to colleges on equal terms with men shows that the school adjusts itself to the growth of educational ideas ; the idea of a practical education, so called, has spread till all classes of schools — the public school, the college, and the university — have felt its touch and have remodeled courses of study so as to harmonize with the new idea. Similarly this is true of social and industrial life. This crystallization of institutional thought and feeling makes progress possible, — a given generation profiting by the labor of the one that is past, and building for the one that is to come.

But this is not all gain ; for an idea, after embodiment in institutions through formal enactment or by well-established custom, tends to cease growing ; it becomes very largely a conservative force, and hinders to some extent further progress. The established order in society sets itself up in the minds of people as an ideal to be maintained, and public sentiment moves away only after another and different ideal wins the people to its support.

Unless public opinion is unanimous, it is impossible to embody it completely in a rule of action. In most cases,

even after successful revolution, there is a form of the dominant sentiment too radical to gain the support of a majority. The unembodied sentiment may constitute the germs of a new movement, and under appropriate conditions may produce a conscious difference between what is and what ought to be. When this difference becomes marked, a conflict usually follows; it may be only a spirited controversy; it may be a new revolution. In the latter case, public sentiment is marked by a high degree of consciousness, by great intensity of passion and the destruction of old forms of thought and action, and by the rapid development of new phases.

It often happens in movements attended by the display of passion that many temporary and extraneous phases of sentiment appear, catch the ear of a faction, then disappear and cease to affect either of the great currents of thought and feeling.

From this examination of the law of differentiation as applied to the growth of institutional life as a whole, and to the embodiment of growth in permanent forms, certain inferences may be drawn:

1. That the phenomena of history may be grouped in five different classes; that history is not confined to the study of politics, but includes the entire life of a people.[1]

[1] It is interesting to note the progress made on this point by our school histories. The earlier texts gave large space to military exploits of all kinds, particularly those with the Indians. This class of works was followed by another that gave less attention to war and more to the study of political events, but ignoring, in the main, the other four phases of life. Many of these texts are now in use in

2. That there are five lines of growth that move on down through the life of a people and give linear continuity to the subject, and, therefore, a clue to the method of its organization.

3. That each of these phases of a people's thought clusters around and becomes embodied in a great and permanent institution.

4. That the more advanced phases of sentiment do not, for the time, become embodied in either law or custom, and thus they form germs that may produce a conflict between what is and what ought to be. Hence the student must take account of ideas and sentiments that fail to find acceptance with the majority.

The Five Phases not always of Coördinate Historical Value. — While these great ganglia of humanity's life are all structurally essential to its well-being, yet they are not, at all times and in all movements of that life, of equal historical value. Movements, large or small, have been characterized usually by the predominance of one of these phases. Now it is the religious, again the political; and at another time the social and economic are so blended in the movement that neither seems to dominate; often, as will be demonstrated below, the results may be profoundly felt in every phase of institutional life, and yet very seldom are found equally distributed among them.

Political institutions absorb public attention in our age more than any others. This is partly an epochal tendency,

schools. But another kind of history text is beginning to find favor, one that takes account of the whole life of the people.

for it was hardly true of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But it seems mainly true now because governmental functions have been so extended as to have oversight of all other interests. At least, government undertakes to adjust the interests of the various institutions so as to promote the best life of the whole and of its parts. While each institution reacts upon government, yet it effects this indirectly, and more or less unconsciously. The state, therefore, gives direction not only to political history, but to some extent to all history. Since politics is not political only, it seems proper that the political phase of life should constitute a greater portion of history than any other.[1]

The Organic Unity of Institutional Life. — Although the process of differentiation has given us five well-marked sets of institutional ideas, yet the principle of continuity teaches us to look for their organic unity. Some illustrations will set forth this life-connection between the phases.

The French and Indian war was a great military event, and, as such, belonged immediately to the domain of government. It produced, as we should expect, great political results, but besides these there flowed from it religious and industrial consequences of almost infinite importance. This struggle decided that North America should become a new home for English Protestantism, and that French Catholicism must return to European soil. This result lifted a great load from the minds and hearts of the English

[1] Whether this ought to be so may perhaps be a question, but that it is so is not a question, whatever the explanation.

colonists. Yet, even if victory had belonged to France, the religious effect would have been just as great, and the principle of historical growth would have been as fully illustrated. Again, this war brought into personal contact the Puritan, the Baptist, the Dutchman, and the Cavalier; they messed together, marched together, and fought together; they shared each other's joys and sorrows, victories and defeats. Seven years of this and other forms of mutual intercourse did much to tone down religious exclusiveness and prejudice. A series of military events thus produced profound religious effects. This war also decided that free instead of parochial schools should bless America; and yet more, for it destroyed the possibility of French family and social life. This long struggle also burdened both England and the colonies with heavy debts. The former tried to lighten her load by putting new burdens on the trade of the latter. The colonies replied by refusing to have commercial intercourse with England, and began to develop their own resources, which led the way to commercial as well as to political independence. So much for the political, religious, educational, industrial, and social effects of a series of military events.

The American Revolution was a mighty political upheaval whose forces are not yet spent. The American people came out of this struggle with greatly modified social, moral, and religious ideas and feelings.

Let us push our examination further by looking at a form of growth that did not have its origin in politics. The planters at Jamestown took that first cargo of dusky

freight purely as a business venture; they simply asked how to raise tobacco in the easiest and cheapest way; they had no thought of its bearing on the other forms of institutional life. The venture proved successful and the system of slave labor filled the South. But slavery gave the master and his children wealth and leisure, while to the non-slaveholding white, it brought poverty and toil; he could not win a competence for himself and family in competition with slave labor; whatever his ambition, the poor white could hardly break over the industrial barrier that slavery built between him and success. The children of the planter could be educated, but this institution which began as a business venture denied to the child of the non-slaveholder an opportunity for an education; poverty could not educate its children, and slavery refused to build free schools. These differences drew a sharp line through Southern social life. There was little fellowship between the two classes of families, for this industrial venture had given into the hands of one class all the social amenities that wealth, leisure, and intelligence could bring, while to the other class all of these were denied. All these influences made the slaveholder the politician of the South; no other class was so well fitted for statesmanship. He was the most desirable man to send to the colonial legislatures, and afterwards to the National Congress. This industrial venture seemed to favor office-holding, for the South, at all times, furnished a larger proportion of national officials, according to her population, than any other section of the country. In the colonial legislatures, the

slaveholder passed laws that favored the development of this industrial system. In the nation at large, slavery organized and destroyed political parties, dictated the nomination of candidates for the presidency, defeated candidates opposed to its interests, declared war, and made treaties. Not only did this industrial system thus mold the politics of our country, but it also colored the moral and religious thought and feeling of the entire nation; it forced Southern pulpits to manipulate Holy Writ in its defence; it rent in twain religious organizations that were hoary with age. Thus we see that negro slavery, an industrial institution in its origin, affected most profoundly every phase of our institutional life.

If this analysis be correct, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. That the life of a people is an organic whole; that this life is one mighty stream of five currents moving on toward one goal; that there is not one destiny for government, another for the church, another still for the school, and a different one for industrial and social interests, but that all these constitute one life with one destiny.

2. That the student must trace transverse and intricate, as well as parallel, lines of growth in the subject of history; that he must take each great event and each great series of events, and discover the extent to which many or all of the institutions are affected, thus producing in his own mind a body of organized knowledge which shall be the subjective counterpart of that objective unity found in the life of a people.

PROCESSES INVOLVED IN ORGANIZING HISTORY.

The General Nature of Organization. — The general principles wrought out in the preceding pages throw some light on the possibility of organizing historical material. It is now proposed to ask how the mind takes what appears at first view as disconnected and isolated facts of history and organizes them into a consistent body of knowledge; to state and illustrate the particular processes through which this material goes, and the final form it takes in the mind of the student. This will make clear the transformation of historical matter into a system of thought.

The analysis of the processes involved in organizing a subject makes the student conscious of the so-called scientific view of the subject. Science declares that every subject of investigation presents two sets of facts for organization, generals and individuals, — laws and principles on the one hand, and particular and specific phenomena on the other. Neither set viewed alone constitutes the subject, nor do both, taken merely in the aggregate; it is only when the mind grasps these two sets of facts in their organic unity that we have a subject in the true scientific sense. The relation is a vital one, for science declares that principles [1] are originally discovered by the examination of

[1] Principles in history resemble all others in being general in their nature, and differ from some in being active forces moving to the

individual facts, while the latter are to be looked upon as the concrete embodiment of principles ; in other words, if the mind begins with one it must pass to the other and back again in order to realize the scientific ideal so far as organization is concerned. The problem of organization, therefore, is really the problem of constructing a science, that is, of discovering, stating, and explaining the relations between these two sets of facts.

Organization is, therefore, a mental process and not a mechanical one. No subject, as many teachers unfortunately think, can be organized in a notebook or on a blackboard. At best, such an arrangement of words and signs can only suggest a few of the relations and processes involved in organization. Too often systems of lines, braces, and brackets delude the mind and become a substitute for that real organization which can only take place in the thinking mind.

The Organizing Principle of History. — There is a central principle in every subject which sets it off from every other subject, and at the same time is the very core of its every phase and fact.[1] In history we have found this central principle to be the growth of institutional

production of the individual facts through which they express themselves. Like most principles, they inhere in content rather than in form, and vary in degree of generality from those found in a few individual facts to those sweeping in all the individuals of the subject.

[1] A fact may be found in one or in many subjects according as it contains the central idea of one or many subjects. The same fact may appear in biology, geology, and history, but in each case it is related to a different principle and exhibits a different content.

life, because this idea touches and is touched by all the great events which mark the course of human destiny. Some events have helped and some have hindered the evolution of institutional life, but all have been related to it. Not only is this principle fundamental to all events, but also to all sub-phases of human thought and feeling, whether they have characterized periods of calm or periods of agitation, — periods of evolution or periods of revolution.[1]

The Fundamental Processes in Organization. — We have already learned that organization names the processes by which the mind arranges the material of a subject according to its inherent relations. Based upon the relations between the principles of history and its particular facts, historical organization has two fundamental processes :

1. Interpretation, which gives the basis for integration and division ;

2. Coördination and subordination, which results in the proper selection and ranking of facts.

THE PROCESS OF INTERPRETATION.

Nature and Kinds.

Definition of Interpretation. — Interpretation is the process by which the mind puts meaning or content into

[1] Some excellent thinkers in history express the universal organizing principle of history in terms of rational freedom. Perhaps the only practical objection to this statement of the principle is that it is too abstract to permit a statement of subordinate phases.

individual facts. This is a universal process and goes on wherever mind and object meet. In each individual fact two phases of content are discovered by interpretation: one phase is common to many other facts, while the other is peculiar to the interpreted fact. When interpretation reveals a content common to many individuals the basis of integration is found, while the discovery of the particularizing element furnishes the ground for division.

In history the process of interpretation is carried on by discovering the growth of institutional life in particular events or in some more individual phase of thought and feeling. There are thus two kinds of interpretation in history; one puts content into events, and the other puts content into subordinate phases of institutional life.

The Interpretation of Events. — Here external occurrences are viewed as the sign of some internal movement of the people's thought and feeling. To discover this movement through its sign, the event, is to interpret the latter. We have learned that just as a word is the sign of an idea, so is the act of a people the sign of their ideas and feelings. The event is the more easily interpreted because a people in conscious action generally selects the kind of event best adapted to give expression to its states of thought and feeling.

The full meaning of an event is obtained by viewing it under two relations: 1. As a product of a preceding movement in thought and feeling. Here the event is seen to emerge from the concrete life of a people and to be a natural and normal result of surrounding conditions.

In other words, the event is viewed as a sort of receptacle into which the preceding current of public sentiment flows, and which it really created in the course of its development. 2. The second step in the interpretation of an event is to view it as a factor producing changes in the movement out of which it grew. Here the event returns, as it were, into the stream of institutional life, and works there those changes which it is capable of producing as cause. Both of these points of view of the content of an event are necessary to its complete interpretation. If the event to be interpreted is a great one or is long continued, then a third step must be taken, namely, to see how public opinion changes while the event is in the process of occurring. The excitement of action intensifies thinking, and produces changes in the minds of the persons involved. These changes are often very great, as in the case of a series of events, such as a war. Sometimes this is the only means of accounting for the changes set on foot by the event. In such instances, this intermediate step would become second in the process of interpreting an event. Some illustration of the interpretation of events will serve to make the conception more accurate.

The founding of Jamestown was an external event, and it remains such to the student until it is discovered to be the product and the sign of England's desire to extend her institutions and interests to the western continent. Further content is given to this event when its success is seen to stimulate the national desire for colonial empire.

The formation of societies for non-importation by the

colonial merchants is an event to be interpreted. In general, this is to be done by discovering in these organizations an idea reaching further than they did, and which appears as content in a wider range of events, and also by discovering in them a form of sentiment peculiar to them. The idea found as the content in these events is that of union then (1765) growing up and beginning to control the acts of the colonists from Maine to Georgia. We put union into these organizations by discovering that they are caused by the agitation for organized resistance to the Stamp Act. In doing this the student views this series of events as the natural outgrowth of the movement toward union begun before 1765. But he must take another step, and trace the immediate effect of these participations in organizations on the further growth of the sentiment of union, and thus gather their contribution to this great struggle. This is done by watching how coöperation in their formation and functions roused a stronger sentiment, — how it made aggressive the society of the Sons of Liberty; gave origin to the Daughters of Liberty with their organizations for the promotion of household production and the development of an infectious enthusiasm for American liberty; and finally how it stimulated those lower passions of hate and spite between the friends and foes of the new movement, and made each firmer in the position taken. But the student must go further in his interpretation, and trace the effect of non-importation upon American thought and feeling. He must see how the merchants gained greater confidence in union and coöperation through these organi-

zations, since by them they entailed an immense industrial loss upon the English merchant, manufacturer, and laborer. Here the student ought to see the consternation of these classes : of the merchant as no more orders for goods came from America, of the manufacturer as he closed his establishment or discharged a portion of his laborers, of the latter as they ceased to draw wages, and were unable to pay debts and to buy food; and the united action of all these in storming parliament with petitions, and finally the great speeches in that body which reveal changing national sentiment in favor of repeal. In these facts he will discover the true explanation of how fidelity to union was exalted into a virtue, and how opposition was regarded as a crime, how non-importation began to be looked upon as an efficient means of commercial retaliation, which lasted long after the revolution was over.

It may not be amiss to explain here how the process of interpretation cannot be carried on. It is customary, when explaining the non-importation societies, simply to say that "they were caused by the Stamp Act." For the student, this may or may not be true. In one sense it cannot be true, for one external act has little if any direct historical influence over another. The Stamp Act and the non-importation societies, as external facts pictured in imagination, were three thousand miles apart and could not touch each other. Let us suppose that physical contact is not meant. Can the teacher be certain from the statement quoted what is meant? Ordinarily it would not mean that the relation to public sentiment had been traced ; that these organiza-

tions had been seen to grow out of, and back into, this sentiment. Perhaps the pupil is left to the ingenuity of his own imagination to discover the true relations between these events. So long as that imagination passes directly from one event to another, no possibility of interpretation exists, for one individual fact has no interpretative power over another of the same rank.

The Interpretation of Phases of Institutional Life. — The fact that the principles of a subject vary in degree of generality, and that the less general phases of institutional growth are phases of some more general movement, makes the process of interpretation possible for this class of historical facts. This form of interpretation may be illustrated in a brief manner by the following example. The dominant idea in forming the Confederation, the cause for which the small states struggled in the convention of 1787, the principle in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, the recommendations of the Hartford convention, the doctrine of nullification as set forth by Calhoun and South Carolina, and the principle of secession, were only phases of the same great idea, — the sovereignty of the state. For the mind to discover the identity of this general institutional idea with this large number of apparently isolated and particular phases, is to interpret them. The meaning of each particular phase is greatly enriched by discovering in it the principle of state sovereignty. Other illustrations on a large scale may be found in the phases of union developed during the revolution, and also in the sentiment of nationality from 1789 to 1860.

Forms of Thought and Sentiment as Discovered in Interpretation.

Causes. — It must be apparent, already, that the process of interpretation aims to put the student into close and intimate contact with the people whose life he studies. How to make events and other facts adequately reflect that life is a vital question in teaching history. In order to do this, at least all the important phases of thought and sentiment in a given movement must be reached. All the various colorings that public opinion puts on in its process of growth will serve to deepen and enrich impressions. To see the way in which these various effects are produced in institutional life greatly aids their interpretation. In fact it is absolutely essential to right interpretation that history be conceived as a process. But it is difficult to view it as such, although we have seen this to be a fundamental characteristic of its content. The imagination is prone to picture scenes and situations and thus deceive the judgment into thinking history statical. This false view is best corrected by constantly tracing the influences and forces that produce the historical process. Such factors are denominated causes, but they are such to the student only when traced into the current of institutional life. It is quite fashionable now to go outside the historical field into the domain of geology, geography, and so on, to find the causes of the historical process. This is entirely proper and necessary, provided the student can trace these extra-

historical causes into the current of human thought and feeling and note there the changes made. Only in this way can other subjects contribute to the interpretation of history.

We have already seen that in the general process of interpretation the student must put into the event the public sentiment that precedes and succeeds it. In doing this the mind looks upon the movement of this sentiment as a cause producing the event, and as an effect partly produced by the event. We thus see that the content of events may be viewed as both cause and effect. It will make interpretation clearer if we look at the nature of historical causes.

Positive and Negative Causes. — On the basis of their essential nature we may class causes as positive or negative. Public sentiment, or any force which molds public sentiment, is positive when by virtue of its essential nature it tends to progress, tends to promote civilization. A positive cause is constructive in intent and being. A negative cause is a phase of public sentiment or a force which tends, from its inherent nature, to be destructive, or at least obstructive ; it tends to stand in the way of progress. Thus the sentiment that favored union in the colonies against the aggression of England was positive, while the attitude of king and parliament was negative. The sentiment in favor of a strong government during the Confederation was a positive cause, for, in its nature, it was progresssive and constructive ; while the opposition to the adoption of the Constitution was a negative cause, for the

reason that it tended, from its nature, to hinder progress. The causes of the Civil War, or of any great war, may be classified in the same way. If revolutions be compared as to the number of positive and negative causes, it will be found that the greater number of negative causes belong to the most destructive revolutions, while the number of positive causes increases as the revolution approaches the character of an evolution in institutional life. Hence the interpretative value of classifying the causes of a movement in history under these categories.[1]

Fundamental and Particular Causes. — In viewing the contents of events as active forces, a more valuable classification of causes may be found based upon differences in the degree of generality in the content. On this basis the student will discover that some are particular and special, while others are general and fundamental. The particular and the general, we have seen, bear a vital relation to each other in every department of knowledge. Hence, to be able to discover a series of causes as particular phases of some greater truth means not only more perfect interpretation, but is a long step toward organization in the form of integration. An illustration will make this clear. Let

[1] Careful analysis will reveal that positive movements produce at times negative results. The American Revolution, as a whole, was a mighty, positive force, making for progress in almost every phase of institutional life, and yet many of its results were negative. Likewise negative causes may produce positive results. The Boston Port Bill was negative, and yet it produced many positive results. In all such cases some factor intervenes to turn the cause toward an effect opposite in nature.

us take the causes of the decline of the Confederation. Here they are, as frequently seen in text-books :

1. The Confederation had no executive or judicial department.

2. Congress could not raise an army.

3. No power of direct or indirect taxation was given to the Confederation.

4. Congress had no control over domestic commerce.

5. Congress could not enforce treaties with other nations.

6. The Confederation operated on states and not on individuals.

7. The Articles of Confederation recognized the sovereignty of the state.

8. Voting in congress was by states.

9. The people owed allegiance to the state only.

The effect of these and of other causes that might be named was the destruction of the Confederation. As causes they were forces in the process of working out the result indicated. The student must see them as such — must witness them in this process — if the right interpretation is to be made and a proper value set on each cause as a factor in the result. But there are three views, any one of which he may take. He may look upon these statements as expressing a given amount of historical fact, statistical in its nature, which may be learned by using memory, thus gaining no interpretation. Again, the student may see each of these as a real force moving toward its own result. Each is thus only an individual and

isolated cause and hence of little organizing value. This is always the result of seeing only a series of direct or particular causes.

The above points of view may be taken without the consciousness of the fundamental cause coming into the student's mind. In this state of mind he sees no connection between the first cause given above and the last one. The identity of causes two, three, four, and so on, with the last cause in the list is not perceived. The only connection, the only kinship among these causes that this view gives is that each aids, as a cause, in producing the same result, — the downfall of the Confederation. This process is vastly superior to the first named, for it yields more discipline and a better understanding of the subject.

Another view may be taken: the general or fundamental cause may be found and the others may be interpreted with reference to it. The careful comparison and contrast of the causes listed above will show that the first eight are closely related to the ninth cause. By common consent, when the colonists transferred their allegiance from England, they gave it on all domestic concerns primarily to their respective colonial governments. The Continental Congress recognized this relation in creating the Confederation by making the states, in the main, sovereign. Wherever primary allegiance is placed, there sovereignty will reside. This shows that allegiance conditions sovereignty, and that cause seven is the result of cause nine. Great men like Madison and Hamilton attributed much of the Con-

federation's weakness to the fact that it did not operate on individuals. The truth is that the Confederation had no individuals — citizens — on which to operate. The people were citizens of the states, because they had placed their allegiance there, hence cause nine is the cause of cause six. Why could not congress enforce treaties made by itself? Who violated such treaties? Evidently the citizens of the states. What power had congress over them? None, since they owed allegiance to their respective states. Thus cause five is the effect of cause nine. The fourth cause in the list bears a similar relation to the last one. Logically, the framers of the Confederation could not have given the Confederation control over domestic commerce after recognizing that the people owed it no direct allegiance. It would simply have aggravated the situation if the Confederation had been given executive and judicial departments. The attempt of the executive to enforce the laws of congress or execute the decisions of the judges would have brought the states and the Confederation into violent collision, for the citizens of the states would have been constantly appealing to their own authorities for protection. The men who made the Articles were more logical than some of their critics have been.

In the same way the remaining particular causes of the fall of the Confederation may be traced to the fundamental cause, thus illustrating its interpreting value, as compared with the other possible ways of viewing the causes of this great event in American history. From every point of view we must see that the reduction of these causes to

their highest terms is vastly more to be desired than either of the other methods of working with them.

It thus appears possible to reduce a series of particular causes to one fundamental one, or at least to a few. In no subject is it more difficult than in history to reduce diversity to unity. The constant tendency of the student, especially in dealing with causes, is to enumerate facts which have obvious differences and take it for granted that a new fact has been discovered, when in truth the new fact may be only another embodiment of a general idea which has already been often discovered in other particular facts. A similar study of the causes of the Civil War will show like results, the reduction of a larger number of particular causes to one, slavery, or at most two, slavery and state sovereignty. This illustration is an example of the process of interpreting great movements as a whole in the light of their causes, and may also be viewed as illustrating the interpretation of particular phases of thought[1] rather than the interpretation of events. It is very apparent that the teacher may set his class a very interesting and valuable problem: Analyze the particular causes for a general cause and show how the general cause is found in each particular cause.

The classification applied to causes may be extended to effects with the same educational advantages. The interpretation of a movement as a whole not only requires a study of causes but also of its effects, for the nature of

[1] Other illustrations of this most important form of interpretation will be given under the various periods.

a movement is partly expressed in its results. Results reflect to a large extent the movement as a whole which produced them. Hence to classify these as positive or negative and as general or particular is to give a fuller understanding of the movement.

Purpose and Means. — The process of interpretation is not complete if it leaves out of the content of historical facts the intention and motives of men. The ambition of a single great man, the plans and purposes of men in organizations — societies, parties, armies, or nations — are factors in the movement of history. In truth, most of the physical forces of history are transformed and enter human consciousness as motives and ends on account of which men struggle.

Causes and effects may come and go in history for a long time without arresting the attention of the people, or at most, without absorbing enough notice by touching their interests to create a conscious effort for a well-defined end. As long as this is true, the categories of cause and effect are sufficient to account for and to interpret historical movements. But when causes and their effects begin to be more widely recognized, men assume a new attitude toward them. As the movement increases in intensity, persons arise who seek to promote or retard it, or it may be, to use it for other and ulterior ends. When this stage is reached, the student must always take into account the transformation that has taken place. What was once an unconscious moving energy becomes now a great stream of thought and activity marching toward

some well-defined goal. A striking illustration of this transformation of cause and effect into means and end is seen in the growth of sentiment that made the Civil War possible. Without trying to be very specific we may say that one of the causes of the struggle was the estrangement that grew up between the two sections. This result was of slow growth, its roots extending far back into colonial days. But in that early time no one recognized or took account of it, — its work was going on silently. It was not until the first quarter of this century that even great statesmen in both sections began to bestow upon it anything like continuous thought. The Missouri struggle was the first event to call general attention to the growing gulf, and although the Webster-Hayne debate, nullification by South Carolina, and the struggle for the right of petition attracted still wider attention to the disparity in thought and feeling between the two sections, yet the idea of their estrangement took great hold on only a few minds. From now on Webster and Clay are devoted, each in his way, to the preservation of the Union, while Calhoun, perhaps unconsciously, gives up his life to a cause that could only promote the growing estrangement of the two portions; yet it is plain that the majority of the people at this time did not take the question into their thoughts and feelings and resolve to accomplish certain ends, — one part of the people had not yet resolved to give its life to secession or the other to the preservation of the Union. More and more, however, these ideas began to win men to their support, till, in the latter part of the fifties, as

the old parties were dissolving under the pressure of the conflict, the two sections stood arrayed against each other, one marshalling its forces under the banner of secession and the other under the flag of the Union. Yet even at the opening of the war the sections were not agreed among themselves as to the supreme end of the conflict. For in the South some held to secession only as a means to preserve slavery, while in the North some still called for the destruction of slavery as the highest aim of the war.

Other illustrations will be found in the organizing ideas of the various periods. The same law of growth — the transformation of causes and effects into purposes and means — will be seen. The mastery of this relation between these two pairs of categories is essential in the explanation of great movements in history. It will be seen how inadequate an explanation is that which rests on causes and effects alone, or upon purposes and means alone. It should be made clear that purposes and motives often arise out of conditions and in the presence of facts that may be called causes, and that these causes are modified by the purposes they originate and the means used in their realization.

The effort to attain ends projected by men as individuals or as nations will give rise to a series of events. This suggests that purposes are causes. In fact, it is rightly held that the purpose of an event, if it have one, is its true cause. At least the peculiar form of the event is due to the fact that it comes into being as a means to accomplish

a result that exists in idea before the event takes place. This difference the student must always detect between an event resulting from an ordinary cause and one that results from a purpose. For on the difference in the form of events depends the conclusion as to whether they result from conscious or unconscious thought and feeling. The conventions in the various states that met to consider the question of ratifying the Constitution, took their peculiar form as events from the nature of the end they were to subserve. Their adaptation to the end in view existed in the thought of the people before the conventions existed in fact. We cannot say that the Stamp Act Congress was in the minds of British statesmen as an end to be accomplished by the passage of the Stamp Act. But one cause of the Stamp Act Congress did exist in thought before it did in fact, namely, the determination to secure the repeal of the Stamp Act. The men who passed the act did not consciously plan to arrange the act so that it would produce a congress of the colonies, but the men who secured the repeal of the act did consciously plan the congress to that end. There is, then, a greater degree of adaptation between the purpose and its means than between the cause and its effect. This greater degree of adaptation often suggests a difference in the content of the two classes of events, especially on the side of feeling. The event or the series of events created by the people for the attainment of some cherished end is permeated by an intensity of feeling that is impossible in events that come into being more or less unconsciously.

Without this idea many series of events could hardly be organized. How could the individual facts of a military campaign become intelligible unless the student can illuminate them by the design of the head of the army? How shall it profit a student if he learn the numbers and discipline of the army, the amount and kind of arms and stores, the position of the troops, the character of the country, the movements of the battle, the stratagems employed, without seeing the common idea in each, — the idea that makes an intelligible whole, — the purpose of the general. Of a series of events used as means the end must be seen in each. This is discovered in two ways: 1. By noting how the means are adapted to secure the given end. This point has just been illustrated. 2. By watching the means in the process of working out the end in view. The very nature of a means requires that it shall take part in a process, otherwise the end could never be actualized. If the student fails to witness this process, he fails to get at least one-half of the relation which means bears to end. It is easy to say or to learn that Hamilton's bank aimed to strengthen the national government. It is quite another thing to trace the steps by which this end was realized. No doubt Hamilton and Washington and the leading Federalists saw the bank in the process of bringing into real existence a result that once existed in their thoughts and desires only. The student, to reach a correct interpretation, must see this means moving to its end just as the men who observed it did. He must observe that the creation of the institution called into existence, in spite of a most deter-

mined opposition, the doctrine of implied powers; that the stock of the bank was taken up by business men with great avidity, thus binding certain capitalists to the government by ties of interest, and giving confidence to other business men; the student must see how the presence of uniform bank notes payable in specie impressed the people with the wisdom of the new plan and the weakness of the old; how the credit of the nation in the eyes of foreigners was raised by having a responsible financial agent through which it could secure loans. And finally, he must discover that the bank's objects were so perfectly secured that its original enemies were lessened, its recharter defeated in 1811 by but one vote in the lower house, and was carried in 1816. In some such way the student must watch and trace means in the very process by which their ends are attained. Otherwise a set of means becomes a mere collection of mechanically related facts.

Immediate and Remote Ends. — In the process of interpretation it is helpful to distinguish between immediate and remote ends. The difference here is mainly one of degree. A remote purpose is one that can be secured by the use of many intermediate steps; but the people may project a purpose into each step. The people as a whole come more easily to the contemplation of immediate than remote ends. The probability of speedy attainment seems necessary to stimulate the majority of men to enthusiastic devotion to a cause. Only statesmen, philanthropists, and reformers seem able to strive with persistent zeal for ends whose fulfillment may belong to the remote

future. The student must see, therefore, that, as a rule, the more immediate the purpose he finds in an event or series, the closer he is getting to the mind and heart of the people as a whole concerned in the undertaking. But while this is true, at the same time he is dealing with ends that are to the leaders of a people's destiny only so many means in the process of attaining remote and more profound objects. It thus becomes necessary, if the student masters the thought and feeling of any period in its completeness, to compass both the immediate and the remote ends and aims that moved the people of that time.

The levying of the tax on tea in 1767 had for its immediate end the collection of a revenue on tea and some other articles. This seemed to most of the people of England and America the chief end in view. But by the leaders in both countries the raising of a revenue was looked upon as a means, while the ultimate end to be reached was the submission of America to parliamentary authority. In America the great mass of the people had before themselves resistance to the tax by the formation of non-importation and non-exportation societies, while the leaders in the agitation looked upon these efforts as mere means in the accomplishment of a remote and more universal end, — the acknowledgment that Americans were entitled to the rights of Englishmen. To get the full content of this struggle, the student must find the motives of all parties engaged in it.

In the efforts to attain their ends men and nations bring about results which were not planned by them, and

whose occurrence they could not foresee. Men may plan and arrange means to carry out definite ends, but effects of an opposite nature often result from their efforts. Passion, interest, and selfishness may be the motive and the end, yet out of these may come results that will bless posterity to the remotest generations. The selfishness of slavery annexed Texas and brought on war with Mexico, from which was wrested an imperial domain. Yet how different the remote result from the immediate aim. Morris' *Hegel* contains the following on this general point:

"The particular historic event exists by the grace of the particular volition of a particular human being; it is immediately what the individual intended, and is explained by his intention, but by the grace of God it acquires a character beyond what was intended, requiring a deeper and broader explanation. The whole interest and thought of the individual may be practically confined to his immediate personal aims and restricted plans. Beyond them he may not consciously see; to aught beside them he may be indifferent. But the sequel shows them to have been the material for the accomplishment of a plan of history, which is none other than the realization on this planet of self-consciousness and self-mastering spiritual existence, passing himself through knowledge and control of a natural world of which he is the crown, and through knowledge and love of a God who is the ultimate ground and the eternal goal of all travail both of Nature and of Man. Thus God makes even the wrath of man to praise him."

This view makes the whole process of history — all its events and all ambitions of men and of nations — a means in the working out of the Divine Ideal.

Material Presented for Interpretation.

Second-hand Material. — The facts of history come to the student in all stages of interpretation. The ordinary narrative text-book mainly confines itself to a description of the externals of history while adding some statements about ideas and sentiments. If the events are presented fully enough, the teacher will have an excellent opportunity to train to interpretation by means of inferences as to the content of events. But since the power to infer specific content from the form of the event is limited, there is need of a larger presentation of the facts in order to obtain a fuller interpretation. These facts may sometimes come from the teacher, but better from the students by the use of larger works as references. The demands of accurate interpretation will not be met by turning this fuller reading into a mere hunt for additional facts, for each would demand interpretation; but since each new fact is an element in the greater event, it will make its contribution to the interpretation needed, if the right attitude of mind is assumed. But if the student is taught by experience to expect that an enumeration of facts will be called for, he will, consciously or unconsciously, prepare for it. If, however, additional and richer meaning of the event is pressed for, he will fuse his collection of details into some great idea

which he now sees, perhaps for the first time, to be a portion of the content of the great event.

The point of view in gathering material to aid in interpretation is of great consequence, for in still another way may it fail of its end. It is often mistakenly believed that some unusual value attaches to gathering the opinions of the various authorities. In the first place, works of similar scope do not vary enough in the amount of matter and the peculiarity of opinions to make it worth while to search for them. In the second place, even if the works are much larger and from a different point of view, it is far better for the student to feel that he is interpreting history rather than the views of various authorities.

Original Material. — Every historical people leaves behind, in some form or other, the direct records of its ideas and sentiments, customs and institutions. These records are the first-hand material out of which history is made, and consist, in the main, of official documents setting forth the ideas and principles of government; of the declarations of political parties, or the creeds of religious sects; of the speeches before legislative and judicial bodies; of the correspondence and diaries of men, great and small; of orations made on the platform, — in short, of any contemporaneous writings that express the nature and tendency of public sentiment in any period. The value of such material largely depends upon the position of its author. If he was in a position to speak for a community, a party, or the nation, his utterance must be of first importance in ena-

bling the student to put the right meaning into the facts which he is endeavoring to interpret. Of course, the record is of much greater value if it embodies officially the institutional ideas of the whole community.

The superiority of this sort of material in the process of interpretation may be understood from the following considerations : 1. The facts thus presented are first-hand — unorganized, and the student is left to contend with a real problem with no ready-made solution at hand; he must work without the author's aid. Without discussing the educational value of this sort of work, it is apparent at a glance, that a wide difference separates the direct study of the Mayflower Compact from the study of a school text's statements about this document. 2. This direct study brings immediate contact with the source of truth concerning the content of the Compact. It is possible that texts have been written whose authors did not have first-hand access to the material of history, but have written from another's interpretation of that material. But what of it? Simply this : the student of such a text will be still farther removed from the real source of truth, and like the author, not knowing all the concrete facts, or not knowing them exactly as they were, may make erroneous interpretations. 3. Even if the facts obtained in the above way are correctly interpreted, there is yet something lacking in the effect produced, which can only be supplied by applying the process of interpretation to original material. In no other way, in the study of historical material, may the student get deep and realistic conceptions of the life he

studies — ideas and passions, motives and prejudices, and all those subtle influences that go to make up concrete public sentiment. Take the examples of interpretation given above: how much more easily and correctly could the student put the right content into the events connected with founding Jamestown if he could read the motives of king and company in the charters granted, and could add to these the opinions of the settlers. Even the writings of John Smith, with all their exaggerations, would give meaning and reality to these events, such as could come in no other way. Again, how can the student get most easily and fully into the minds and hearts of the colonial merchants, the motives and passions that swayed them when organizing the non-importation associations? Evidently by reading the addresses sent to king and parliament and to the colonial legislatures; by reading the resolutions of town meetings in pledging support; by studying the correspondence between the associations of different towns, and by following the newspaper and pamphlet war that arose over these organizations and their work. Likewise with the struggle over state sovereignty, or any other phase of thought which the student tries to reach through events. Depth of impression and richness of content will always come from this sort of face to face contact with a people.

Original matter may be made to serve, as in the case of reference histories, merely as another source of individual facts. This defeats its use as a means of interpretation. In order to make it serve this function truly, the additional

matter must be used as a key to the content of the event or movement under consideration. The student must not, unless he is searching for undiscovered truth, get the idea that he is examining records as records to determine their historical accuracy. Historical interpretation, and not historical criticism, is his problem.

The Educational Value of Interpretation.

Nature of the Question. — The examination into the nature of the process of interpretation has furnished the basis for an intelligible answer to the problem of its educational value. There are two phases to the question: one inquires concerning the effect of interpretation upon the crude material of history, and the other concerning the resulting mental discipline and development. These two phases of the inquiry are intimately related, since both at bottom are questions of mental experience and should be separated only for convenience in discussion.

Integration and Unification. — Interpretation produces, on the side of knowledge, an integrated or synthesized product. Since the ordinary methods of studying history do not accomplish this important educational result, it is worth while to bring this historical product into consciousness and analyze it carefully. Interpretation unifies the facts of history because it discovers in them a common content, and this subjects them to the only process by which knowledge is unified. This is a universal process, since it is common to the organization of material in

every realm of knowledge. It is also a process of highest educational value on account of the degree of strength called forth. No other subject appears at first glance less likely to admit of any sort of integration. On its external side — the one from which the student first sees it — history seems a wilderness of unrelated facts. But interpretation, by discovering common ideas, establishes order among these facts and connections among the larger parts of the subject; and if the process of interpretation is carried on till the student finds the common content of all the leading facts of history, the result is the integration of the subject as a whole. The mind now sees, not isolated and diverse facts, but one great fact, — the growth of institutional life. In order to estimate the educational value of the historical whole we must examine into the nature of the different forms it may take. There are two of these: one in which the whole is a mere aggregation with its parts of the same nature, while in the other form the whole is a principle, or idea, and the parts are its phases. There is a vast difference in the pedagogical value of these two forms, and in the processes by which they are wrought out; and it is of the utmost importance that the teacher be able to recognize which kind of an historical whole he is creating in the student's mind.

The Mechanical Historical Whole. — One of the commonest illustrations in history of this first form of whole is that of time-whole. This is not only common, but is very superficial. Ideas grow and events occur in time, it is true,

but neither are controlled merely by the lapse of years. New ideas and new movements do not begin with the opening of the year nor cease with the closing of a century; hence time-wholes and time-parts are more or less artificial — are aggregations of events united by a bond that is outside of, and apparently around, them. We may think of the expedition against Lexington and Concord as occurring within one day, thus surrounding the event in imagination by the limits of a day. The events under this mental form are an aggregation, exhibiting no living principle which gives them organic union. This event may be thrown into time-parts by perceiving that one portion of the events occurred before daylight, another in the forenoon, and still others in the afternoon. These smaller wholes are artificial, for they do not correspond to the real parts of the event; but even if they did so correspond it would only be a coincidence. The imagination may, and often does, hold a vague picture of the events of American history as limited by the two points in time, — 1492 and 1907. This is also a mere aggregation. It may be definitely separated by other dates into smaller wholes — each time-whole bearing a name which calls up a confused jumble of events that have only time limits. Such periods of history — if they are entitled to so dignified a term — are mere mechanical wholes.

Another illustration of the aggregate whole, in contrast with the organic, is the space-whole. We picture the events of the American Revolution as having certain place-limits, and in so doing we create, as it were, an aggregation — a

mass-whole. By picturing some of these events as belonging in the North, some in the West, and others still in the South, we drop our revolutionary space-whole into smaller wholes. These are not, as the imagination pictures them, derived from any peculiar differences in the events themselves, but are rather divisions based on differences in place, into which we mechanically force the events.

It is necessary that the mind should view the events of history under the forms of time-wholes and place-wholes, but such artificial aggregates can hardly be ends in knowledge. It would be dangerously superficial to let the relatively mature mind stop with such forms of thought or to give much conscious attention to their creation. Such work belongs to the stage of immaturity, but for the logical stage of thought this should be incidental and should result from the mind's struggle with events under the higher form of integration.

The Organic Historical Whole. — The other form of integrated product is one in which parts are made into a whole by the presence of a common idea which permeates each part. Such a whole may be called an organic one — one in which each part exists for the whole and the whole for each part. There is a life-connection here, for the destruction of the whole results in the disintegration of the parts. This whole is not an aggregate but a principle, and its parts are not smaller aggregates, but phases of the general truth. Such a whole expresses itself outwardly by an aggregation, and each phase of the general idea manifests itself in some part of the aggregation.

To see the history of our country as an organic whole requires that the student shall find one idea — the growth of institutional thought and feeling — manifesting itself in all the details of that history. This idea constitutes the whole of our history and also its phases — growth of local institutions, union, and a national spirit. These phases are usually denominated periods, and are really smaller wholes when considered in themselves. Periods in history are such for the student by virtue of the process of integration which follows from interpretation having discovered the great dominant phase of growth which characterizes the period and which furnishes the content of leading events of the time. The periods so viewed are organic wholes. They must be such in order to give the highest form of knowledge and the greatest degree of discipline.

Comparison the Basis of Integration. — Fuller meaning can be given to the educational value of integration in history if we turn from its form — the historical whole — to its process, comparison. Integration is a synthetic process. Constructive mental processes in history, as in all subjects, are based upon the discovery of resemblances in the facts interpreted. The process of interpretation which results in integration is carried on by the special process of comparison, — the process by which the mind discovers resemblances. Comparison, then, is the mental instrument by which historical wholes are wrought out.

In order to produce the best results, comparison should become a conscious instrument in the hands of the student.

When he feels its value by actual conscious experience, he becomes self-directive. Nothing frees him sooner from the monotony and drudgery of the history text than a conscious search for likenesses. These are not often formally expressed in school histories, so that this work may be performed by him under the stimulus of a direction or question put by the teacher. Such work stimulates to real discovery; the student feels that he is getting more than is expressed in the book he uses, and this, too, without the direct aid of the teacher. The consciousness of his own strength thus comes to him, and he begins to be a seeker after first-hand historical truth. When the student forms a taste for searching after resemblances in historical material, the teacher will have no trouble at all in leading him into the habit of enlarging his comparisons by searching more than one author. It must be kept in mind here that this extension of the process is not for the purpose of being able to state the particular views of each author, but rather that the student may have a deeper and fuller knowledge of the facts under investigation. If the likenesses and differences between authors are constantly alluded to, the attention is put in the wrong place. This is not a distinction without a difference. Nothing is more common in teaching history than for very different results to come from different teachers, apparently doing the same thing in the same way. This arises from a very subtle difference — a difference in the point of conscious attention or emphasis.

Integration through Comparison Simplifies Historical Knowledge. — This does not mean simplification by a reduction in the number and complexity of its facts, but, as hinted several times above, by discovering unity in the midst of diversity. This is the process by which the student grows into the conviction that, comparatively, only a few great ideas have battled for mastery on the fields of history; it convinces him that new and strange events may be only the new embodiment of old ideas; new and strange as to form, but old as to content.

Division and its Uses. — It is a law of knowledge that whatever features enter into subjective truth must have their correspondence with objective truth. In no other place is this principle more often violated than in making divisions in history. Perhaps the reason is found in the fact that such divisions are made instead of discovered.

In our analysis of the nature of history it was seen that in obedience to the law of continuity there are no gaps or breaks in the institutional life of a people, but that continuous and connected growth is its characteristic feature. It was discovered that the phenomena of history are subject to another principle of development, — differentiation. It is the movement of institutional life under this law that enables the student to discover progressive changes in the line of growth and thus mark transitions from one phase of thought and feeling to another. The operation of this law enables him to discover in the midst of some dominating movement different tendencies which may, under favoring conditions, become in turn the feature of some other period.

When, by interpretation, it is noted that certain periods of time are marked by peculiar phases of life, the basis for a division into parts is found. If this is to be done consciously for purposes of organization, three or four suggestions must be followed: (1) as already intimated, the parts are to be discovered, not made, — must be found in, rather than fitted on, the subject; (2) that if coördinate and logical parts are to be found, there must be but one basis of division for any set of parts and that basis must be the phase of growth that integrates the facts of the period, or, if possible, some phase of this integrating idea; (3) the basis of division ought to be a fundamental one, that is, some phase of institutional growth rather than portions of time, parts of country, or series of events.

It is quite the custom to divide history into parts on the basis of differences in time, thus marking centuries, half-centuries, and decades in the subject. But these are not so much divisions in the thing studied as divisions in the calendar. It is evident to the student of life that the end of one century and the beginning of another no more mark the end of one movement and the beginning of another than any year within the hundred does. Life moves right on over decades and centuries — does not stop to take a holiday the first day of each new year as is implied in dividing and classifying events by years. Such divisions may be convenient when speaking of history in a general way, but they certainly do not in themselves reveal or designate anything fundamental in the life studied. But if the student needs a framework to lean upon, as little

harm will come from a chronological division as from any other artificial means.

The same objection holds against geographical divisions. These may seem to be convenient, but are generally superficial, misleading, and give no insight into the nature of the thing studied. The familiar division of our history into discoveries, settlements, intercolonial wars, war of the revolution, confederation, administrations, and so on, gives parts that are not entirely artificial, but are based on differences in events; they are somewhat superficial, for they deal with the externals of history rather than with history itself. The basis of separation is not fundamental enough to be helpful in the process of organization. If we drop below the surface-play of events to the growth of institutional ideas — the principle on which the subject as a whole is integrated — and ask what are the great differentiating features of American institutional life, it will be found that between 1607 and 1860 there are three great forms of development: (1) the growth of European ideas into local institutions; (2) the growth of local institutions into the form of a nation; (3) the development of the spirit of nationality. This division, to be true, must meet all the requirements of organization.

The process of division is not an end in itself, but a means to more concrete interpretation and more minute integration. History is separated into its parts, not only because there is a basis for separation in the thing itself, but, pedagogically, because it enables the mind to attack the problem of historical organization in detail. This idea

of division as a means to more concrete study will be amply illustrated in the application of the principle of organization to the various periods and sub-periods.

The process of division is an analytic one, so far as the subject of history is concerned. In this respect division is the opposite of integration in its product and in its process. Hence the discovery of differences in the act of interpretation trains the mind to make careful discriminations. To get the exact phase of public sentiment demands a most discriminating judgment. Interpretation can be made to do this if the teacher knows the content of the events interpreted and presses the student for it.

It is difficult to see how this analytic study can be pushed too far if there goes at each new step the new act of synthesis — the making of a new integration. But when the end is forgotten, and especially when the process is applied to the mere form of historical material, events and other accidental features, then there is danger ahead.

Most of the so-called "methods" of teaching history, such as the topical, the outline, the diagram, the exponential, and the brace method, are based merely on the relations of whole and part. A student may outline or diagram a lesson in history as presented by some author, and know almost nothing about it. The most imposing outlines or diagrams of history are those made independent of any real basis of division, while to be of any teaching value, they must adhere to some fundamental idea as a basis, which usually renders them insignificant in appearance. It should not be forgotten by the diagram-maker

that the student must understand the relations in history before he can make a logical diagram, and that after these relations are once mastered, he has comparatively little use for such artificial representations. Again, the outline and diagram represent historical material as statical, while in truth, it is predominantly dynamical. On still another count these artificial systems are found wanting; they represent on the blackboard or in the notebook a thing that has no corresponding existence in fact; often the pupil carries away only a picture of the subject in two dimensions — a picture utterly unlike, in form and feature, the facts studied; and the only redeeming feature about it is that the pupil will lose his false conception as soon as the artificial framework passes away. Finally, these systems at best are based upon but two out of the many categorical relations. Diagrams are a means, but not a means of very high order.

Interpretation Develops the Historical Judgment. — In the discussion upon the nature of history, it was discovered that the acts of individuals or of nations are adapted to express the thought and feeling that give rise to them. The imagination sets men and nations before the judgment in the process of acting. From what they are seen to do and from the way in which it is done, the judgment reaches its conclusions as to the thoughts and feelings, ideas and emotions that give rise to the events and, therefore, give meaning to them. This act of judgment is the interpretative act proper, and the faculty that puts it forth may be designated as the historical judgment. History is entitled

to give name to this phase of the judgment's activity from the fact that history almost, if not entirely, alone stimulates and develops it. It would seem that it is reserved for history to confer upon the mind the peculiar and very important faculty of reading thought and feeling through deeds.

The training which gives the power to reach the plans and purposes of men through their acts has not only high pedagogical value, but also has very great practical value. Progress in historical study is largely dependent upon the growing skill with which the student can infer accurately and rapidly the content of events as they pass in quick review before the imagination. Mere accumulation of facts in memory is not meant here, but instead, that power which gets from events or facts described in historical narrative, their true significance. The power to do this has direct and important bearing on the affairs of every-day life. What else are men doing who meet each other in the various walks of life? Men contend or men coöperate in the conduct of all the institutions of human society. But to do either well—intelligently and successfully—they must penetrate to ideas, motives, and plans through the deeds of one another. How poorly we judge of the conduct of men and of society! Surely there is need that teachers of history shall recognize and utilize the capacity in their own subject, to confer upon the student this peculiar guiding power.

The exercise of the historical judgment in the process of interpretation fosters the formation of a most valuable habit of mind,—the habit of questioning appearances. This

is not only an important historical habit, but it is of great thinking value to the non-historical student, for its tendency is to force the mind to look through appearances to reality — to look through phenomena to the laws of phenomena. Every act of historical interpretation gives the mind this tendency.

Emotional Results of Interpretation. — The preceding discussion of the educational value of interpretation has considered only intellectual processes and products. But some of the most valuable results of historical study pertain to the stimulus of emotions and the development of character. In the first place, the process of interpretation in history gives the rational basis for interest in the subject. It brings the mind of the student into direct contact with mind as it manifests itself in history; this is life in touch with life. The life of the student responds to the touch of the life of other men in other times. This is inevitable, for, as he touches the whole round of human experience as it is reflected in events, he will find much that is closely akin to his own. It seems strange, therefore, that any one should dislike history. About the only way to prevent a love of history from arising in the normal mind is to refuse it the opportunity of free and sympathetic contact with life — refuse to allow it to enter into the minds and hearts that lived and struggled as it lives and struggles. This is accomplished by turning the student out to pasture on dead events — disconnected and empty. This is a pedagogical consideration of some importance when it is remembered that many pupils, and students even, not only do not

like history but have a positive dislike for it. There are many artificial means used to create an interest in history, but the results are usually delusive because their resemblance to the real thing makes their detection very difficult. The pupil, and even the student, may be apparently interested in history because of an admiration for the teacher, or a desire to make a high record, or to stand well in the estimation of the class, or to be an honor student, or because of some taking device that the teacher, for the time being, employs to revive the lagging interest. None of these reach the test of true interest; each represents a form of interest that deludes teachers, pupils, and students. Interest in the thing for its own sake is the only genuine interest. Proper interpretation will give this.

In the second place, the intimate contact with the life of the past gained through a proper interpretation of events has a still deeper significance in its relation to the emotions; it is the basis of an intelligent patriotism. In this sort of work the student lives over again the life he studies. He sympathizes with and admires men, parties, and nations in their struggles for a just cause. His heart warms to a noble idea or sentiment as he traces its conflict with prejudice and custom. On the other hand, he comes to despise the unjust cause and the efforts of men who live under the impulse of unworthy ideals and employ ignoble means. He is impressed with the idea that after a time the right comes to prevail, and that men and nations who turn their backs upon a good cause and deliberately choose the baser course will, in the end, pay dearly for their choice.

Such a study will enable one to put a juster estimate on the rights and privileges that have been won for him. He thus comes to feel a deep current of sympathy with that for which his own nation stands. He loves it for what it has been, what it is, and for what it will become. This is an intelligent patriotism — the only safe kind. Historical interpretation is the only source of this form of devotion to country. It may be, that, since this ideal of historical study is only partly realized, it is necessary to have a flag over each schoolhouse in the land. Perhaps, even if this ideal were realized, it would still be desirable to have the flag always in sight, but surely the patriotism that comes from having the flag in the mind and heart of each American citizen is the safer sort.

Ethical Value of Interpretation. — When the student passes from the study of causes to the study of purposes and motives, his whole attitude of mind changes. From the very nature of the case, he is challenged to pass judgment on the actors in the drama of passing events. He judges of their ability and sagacity in forming designs and in selecting means for their realization. In the purchase of Louisiana the student will say that Jefferson shows himself to be a farseeing and disinterested statesman, but that in his plan of coast defence he exhibits great ignorance of methods of war. In a similar way he will judge the statesmanship, on its intellectual side, of all the great and small men who have figured in our history. But on another side, and one having very intimate connection, as we have seen, with the question of

right interpretation in history, the student is still more persistent in his determination to arraign men and measures before the bar of judgment; I mean the moral qualities of the motives which move men to action. In this field he would praise Washington and La Fayette for disinterested devotion to the cause of liberty, while he would have condemnation for the selfishness of Gates and Lee. He would extol John Quincy Adams for fidelity to principle both as president and as congressman. His admiration for Webster will turn to regret when he listens to the "Seventh of March" speech. Just as in the conduct of individuals, he will commend or condemn political parties for the motives that sway them.

This process may go on in the student more or less unconsciously. At least it may go on without the knowledge of the teacher, unless, by the character of the interpretation he stimulates the student to give frequent expression to his conclusions in this field. The fact that the student will reach such conclusions is a sufficient reason why the teacher should guide him in the process, — guide, but not dominate, his inferences. No other phase of historical interpretation opens up so widely the opportunity for mistakes in judgment, even where the student is free from prejudice. He needs here, if ever, the guiding hand of one who has sought truth for its own sake — and found it. This guidance finds its best work, not in giving the student bald conclusions which he must accept because the teacher is supposed to be better authority than he is,

but in leading him to gather sufficient data to make his own inferences reasonably true.

The reaction of this phase of study on the student is very profound but also very subtle. It is sometimes good and sometimes bad. The study of generous, broad-minded, unselfish conduct is ennobling in a high degree, but the student must come in contact with conduct of another sort. How rudely is he sometimes shocked when a great character whom he very much admires, as Webster, Clay, or Calhoun, goes astray and devotes the energy of his mighty genius to an unworthy cause. The student in this formative period of mind sets his ideal high, and to find in men he admires any serious departure from this tends to shake his confidence in humanity. This is a result that certainly ought not to come about, and it need not. It ought not to come about because it is usually based on insufficient historical data, and is, therefore, not true to history. Again, it ought not to come about for the reason of its disastrous influence upon the ethical life of the student — it may make him cynical and pessimistic. There is no necessity for a result so untrue to history and so harmful to the student. The teacher may direct the interpretation of events in the light of purposes and motives so that the whole truth of history may be revealed and its ethical message to the student may not be perverted.

Three things can the teacher do to prevent false interpretation: 1. He can show the student that unfair judgments may be reached by projecting his own standard and that of the present into the past and by trying men

and motives by them. The student has been taught the highest respect for the Constitution, and when he reads the story of Patrick Henry's vehement opposition to its ratification, the reputation, and perhaps the character, of that patriot falls in his estimation. He finds it difficult to reconcile Washington's love of liberty and his sacrifices for it, with his owning slaves; and even more so in the case of Henry Clay. But it is evident that in each instance the student is trying these men in the light of his own times. The teacher's duty is to make him truer to history, and then he will be truer to these men and truer to himself. 2. A second means may be used to preserve the ethical equilibrium of the student, — a judicious emphasis upon the lives of men who have been moral heroes, and there are plenty of such lives. The student, like the public in which he lives, takes it for granted that great men do good deeds, and so he is not particularly struck with the everyday life of good men as we have their acts in history. For the truth of history, then, the student should have his attention consciously directed to the influence of good men on the growth of our institutions. This will not be untrue to history, for the influence of the Arnolds, the Burrs, and others who have tried to harm the nation for personal ends, has been, comparatively speaking, very slight indeed. 3. We noticed in another paragraph that there is a tide in the affairs of men that seems not always to be of their own planning. It rides over their narrow, sordid, selfish purposes and makes for ends and results far beyond human comprehension. Or it may be a mighty wave of

chastening public sentiment that rises and overturns the schemes of men, thus reaching some great end in the way of which men and parties stood. The selfishness and greed of men and parties have thus been punished by what seemed an avenging public opinion. The American Revolution, the annihilation of the Whig party, and the defeat of the Democrats between 1854 and 1860, and the destruction of slavery by the proclamation of the son of a poor white in order to suppress armed resistance, are instances of great movements to secure great ends. These, and others like them, can give the student confidence in the ultimate triumph of right over wrong. They will also give him confidence in the ability of the American people to overthrow organized selfishness in whatever form it may appear.

THE PROCESS OF COÖRDINATION.

Nature of the Process.

The Basis of Coördination. — It has been said that the proper solution of the problem of the organization of knowledge in general, and of historical knowledge in particular, depends on discovering and utilizing the relations which exist between the particular facts and the fundamental principle of a subject.

Investigation will show that the facts of a subject embody its fundamental principle in various ways and in varying degrees. Translated into the language of history, this means that different events embody the growth of institutional ideas in different degrees. In carrying on

the process of historical interpretation, the process by which the mind searches for the growth of ideas in events, the student is frequently struck by the richness with which some events, and the barrenness with which others, reveal the thoughts and feelings of the people.

Theoretical and Practical Need. — In order to organize historical knowledge then, something more is necessary than mere interpretation, however valuable that is or however perfectly it may be done. It is necessary, therefore, for the student to pass judgment upon the relative value of the facts or events that have been interpreted. The practical need of this is very apparent in a field like history, where the facts are almost limitless in number, and where they range through all degrees of complexity. The life of one man like that of Franklin has almost innumerable incidents attending its course. The history of a single state numbers its facts almost without limit. What, then, must be true of the amount of matter that may be handled in dealing with the life of a great nation? There must be selection and emphasis here, or history must be given over as a disorganized and lawless subject.

There are few teachers who have not felt the pressing need of some means of selecting from the vast amount of matter to be found in text-books and libraries that particular portion having the highest historical significance. The small amount of time devoted to history, compared with the vast extent of the field, makes the question of selection and emphasis a really "practical" question. It comes every day alike to the teacher in the grades and the professor

in the university. For the sake of truth and for the sake of the learner, each must make an attempt to solve the problem.

The ordinary way is to trust the text-books — at least, in the public schools; and in colleges, adaptability as material for an interesting lecture is too often the basis of selection. If the teacher will compare different text-books on history as to the amount of space given to events, it will be apparent why most of them cannot be trusted to settle the question of the relative value of the facts treated. Not many years ago a very popular text-book on United States history was issued that gave one-half of its pages to our history before the Revolution. If the teacher trusts this text-book, her pupils will spend as much time on our history before 1760 as after it. The same text gives many pages to John Smith's exploits, and a very few lines to the establishment of representative government in Virginia by Governor Yeardly, — an event full of destiny. King Philip's war in New England and the Body of Liberties established by Massachusetts in 1641 are treated after a similar fashion; about two hundred lines are given to the former and less than a dozen lines to the latter. A number of other text-books, while giving attention to King Philip's war, do not even mention the Body of Liberties, nor the early efforts of the Connecticut settlers at constitution-making. Illustrations may be multiplied to show that authors of school histories, as a rule, have no well-defined principle of selection or emphasis, and that the teacher who is guided by them alone will often go astray.

Of course, we ought not to infer that an author in all cases expects teachers to value his material by the amount of space given it. In many cases, from the nature of the facts, the amount of space given to their narration must be out of proportion to their significance. But even if the teacher could trust the author to select and distribute his material according to its value, he would still need, in order to be free, a standard by which he could test the value of the material for himself. There is no growth for the teacher except through freedom conferred by working under the guidance of principles.

The Principle Stated. — All these considerations, theoretical and practical, demand that the principle of selection and emphasis in history be a fundamental one, — one to which the student and teacher may appeal with some degree of certainty. This standard must not be an accidental one ; it must not be set up by the whim of any person and be changed with a change of teachers, but must be one derived from the very essence of history itself — from the relations that exist between its facts and its organizing principle. Since the events of history express the growth of institutional life in different degrees, it must follow that they will have historical value in proportion to their content. We may safely set up the growth of institutional life as the standard for making this test of historical value. To state the principle somewhat formally, it may be said that that event, series, or period has the highest historical value which reveals most fully the people's institutional thought and feeling. Such a fact takes high-

est rank. On the other hand, that event, series, or period which yields the least historical significance will take lowest rank in the subject.

Suggestions as to Application. — There are two phases of this question of historical selection. The teacher, like the author, must first choose between the facts to be omitted and those to be taken. In the second place, a careful measure of the relative value of those selected must be made. The utility of our standard of selection is apparent from the fact that we must appeal to it in making our choice in each case. Why should any fact in American history be omitted and another fact selected? The only logical answer is that the fact rejected does not sufficiently reveal to the student the growth of institutional life. Why should De Soto's expedition form a part of a course in American history, while a hundred other Spanish explorers and their work go unnamed? The only reason is that the work of De Soto had a more intimate connection with our institutions than had those omitted. If one had to choose between the work of George Rogers Clark and that of Daniel Boone, in the Revolution, on what basis should the choice be made? Whose work contributed most to the development of the American institutions, would be the question to put. The answer to this question is the answer to the other question. Problems like these come to the teacher when he attempts to make his own working outline, or when, for the lack of time, he must omit portions of the history text or spend little time upon them. The rational answer in each case

is to be found in the relation of the fact to the fundamental or organizing principle.

It is this phase of the question which presses constantly upon the teacher and is the one that has most to do with the distribution of the pupil's time and energy. This question has been variously designated : some call it "historical emphasis," others, "historical perspective." Whatever the name, the principle is the same, and in its application has to do with deciding between the relative value of periods or series of events, between the members of the series, and between features of each event.

In dealing with the relative value of these forms of historical facts, the teacher can save time for the student by deciding in a general way the relative amount of study that is to be given to the various periods of history. After this is disposed of, the next question of relative values arises from within the periods. Each period, it will be learned, is marked by a dominant movement in institutional growth. This dominant movement furnishes the leading content for interpretation, and also the standard for the relative value of the various series of events that are found within the period. The next problem relates to the relative value of the various series constituting the period ; these express in different degrees the fundamental idea of the period, hence have different historical values and are, therefore, entitled to attention and emphasis in like proportion. But the problem of relative values has, at least, one more important phase : Which is the greatest and which is the least event in the series? A series is

such by virtue of a dominant idea, which idea is either some phase of the dominant idea of the period or is vitally connected with it. How the events of the series embody this sub-idea is the test of their respective values.

It is desirable, if not necessary, here to call attention to the value of certain external features of events. Two in particular, time and place, or chronology and geography, ought to be considered. As ordinarily viewed these two features or accompaniments of events pertain rather to the external side than to the content of events. When so viewed they can have little or no historical value. This ought to suggest, to teachers of dates and dots on maps, that there is possibly something wrong in the venerable custom of committing to memory long lists of dates and places of events.[1] Let us search for a rational basis for judging the place of chronology and geography in history.

Growth in institutional ideas is, as we have seen, along lines parallel in time. Events are located along these lines of growth at intervals of time, this location serving as a means of marking off the stages in the development of ideas. It facilitates interpretation to know the place in

[1] It is strange how teachers who do this deceive themselves into believing in its value. The trick is simple. After the lists are committed and some time has elapsed, the teacher begins — it may be on review — to call for the time and place of events that belong to the lists. Those who have supple verbal memories respond easily and correctly; those who have learned no list, cannot give the exact date and place, and so ignominiously fail. Hence the great value of committing dates and dots!

time an event occupies along this line. Its location, however, includes more than knowing its mere date; for we may know the date of an event as an abstract and empty thing, out of all relation to other events and therefore miss all suggestion as to its content. The fixing of an event in time must be by associating with it events and phases of thought that precede, succeed, and are simultaneous in time. It often occurs that the association of historical facts in the order of time suggests that they may be more fundamentally related as cause and effect, or that there may be a similarity of significance. Whenever time associations are made among such facts it must be remembered that it is never for the sake of the date. The date cannot be an end in itself in the process of interpretation; it must always remain a servant. This fact rightly understood will prevent the pernicious practice of committing long lists of dates with only the name of the event attached. The same amount of energy given to a study of the thoughts and feelings of the people, as revealed in the events belonging to the list of dates, would give a fair knowledge of their content; and at the same time the dates of the events would be sufficiently fixed. This would be a study of history; date-learning is not.

Institutions must grow somewhere, and the place in which a people's life develops exerts a powerful influence over it. Not only do climatic influences modify man's physical activity but his spiritual as well; in one region physical conditions favor reflection while in another they stimulate

sensuous enjoyments. The physical differences between the North and the South partly caused their wide contrasts in institutional life, and through the latter the Civil War. Differences in occupations are largely based on variations in physical conditions; conflicting interests may thus arise that show their influence on legislation. The distribution of relief forms and waterways may determine the direction of trade and the movement of armies. The Hudson River and Lake Champlain region determined the direction and plan of more than one campaign in both the Inter-colonial and the Revolutionary wars. The same thing is true in a greater degree, of the rivers Mississippi, Ohio, Potomac, and James, in our Civil War. It is clear from these facts that the relation of place, like that of time, is a key to knowledge under higher relations. But if the place of an event, including its surroundings, cannot be seen as an active agent transforming ideas and producing events — cannot aid therefore in the process of interpretation — then its historical value is very small indeed. The bald location on the map of all the places named in the text is almost useless work. The danger is that the pupil carries away in memory a certain number of dots located on certain parts of his map; in other words, he locates portions of the map instead of events in their real geographical relations. This gives the imagination no aid in picturing the physical surroundings of things, and has very little historical value. The map is a means in history, whether it is furnished by the book or made by the pupil. The historical map may be made by the stu-

dent, if in the making he gains something of historical value. It should be accurate, rather than beautiful; the end is an historical idea and not an aesthetic emotion.

There must be a great economy in time and energy when the teacher has decided in advance which is the most important period, which is the most important series of events in the period, and which is the most important event in the series. Not only is there great economy in time and energy, but what an immeasurable difference between the student's conception of the subject itself under this plan, and his hazy and bewildered state of mind under the old plan of "going it blind"! The result of testing periods, parts of periods, and events in this way will lead to the discovery of a number of things:

1. That the value of a period or other series of events is not determined by the length of time covered.

2. That some events and series are of such a character and the manner of treatment by certain authors is such that a single reading is all they merit; they may be put in to fill out the picture or to make the connection between more important events.

3. That a single fact may be so close to the people's life that a series of lessons may be spent on it.

4. That this distribution of time and effort will break up the uniform and featureless whole given by the simple process of interpretation, and will create a body of knowledge full of variety, each fact occupying the rank determined by its own value.

Educational Value of Coördination.

We now come to the pedagogical significance of the process of judging relative values. It has already been stated that there are at least two phases to this question: one of knowledge and the other of discipline. There is possibly another phase by inference from these two, namely, what must be done by the teacher in the light of the answer to the other two. This has been partly discussed above.

Effect as to Knowledge. — It has already been made clear that, for complete organization, the material given in interpretation must then be coördinated and subordinated, — that is, arranged in a system on the basis of its historical significance. This result removes the great body of historical facts another step from chaos, the first being unity and diversity through interpretation; now, they are made to assume rank in the subject in light of the place they hold in the life of a people. In most subjects the parts and particular facts have a place and rank that is fairly well recognized. Not so in history. While it may never be possible to rank the facts of history as perfectly as those of many other subjects, yet the loose and reckless manner in which they are handled by teachers shows that a reasonable attempt ought to be made in this direction. Perhaps not much effort in ranking the facts of history has been made because of the nature of the facts; but mainly, however, it is because no coördinating and subordinating principle has been generally accepted. Why has no principle been generally accepted? Chiefly, I think, because students

have not clearly differentiated between the form and the content of history.

There is another way in which this process affects the student's knowledge, that is, by adding to it. When the conclusion is reached that the battle of Lexington is a more important event than the storming of Stony Point — one of the most brilliant military events of the Revolutionary War — the student has added to his stock a fact more valuable than if he had added a dozen mere incidents connected with these events. Many pupils in the public schools and students in higher institutions can state interesting things connected with the purchase of Louisiana and Florida; but, knowing little about their relative importance, cannot explain which produced the greater effect upon the dominant movement of that period. Would it not really be adding to their knowledge of history to discover which produced the greater result upon the life and the thought of the time?

Confers Power to properly Judge Contemporaneous Events. — On the side of discipline a far greater result is produced by training in the ranking of men and events. We have seen how interpretation gives ability and skill in getting into the content of contemporaneous events. Now, experience in determining the relative rank of past events ought to confer the power and skill to estimate similar present facts at their true value. It is not an easy thing to estimate present movements at their true value, and few there are who do not need more of this sort of ability, — few who do not make grave mistakes for lack of power to

balance men and their conduct, parties and their policies, institutions and their ends and tendencies. People are influenced by new movements because they are new; some become absorbed in a small, quiet movement with a great principle behind it, while others are caught by great noisy commotions with little or nothing of principle. Others allow a single idea to fill their attention and absorb their energy to the exclusion of all other ideas, until they come to see it out of its true proportion. All other ideas and movements come to such men through the wrong end of the telescope. It would seem, therefore, that the power cultivated by the process of coördinating and subordinating the facts of history — balancing events, men, and motives — is of great practical value in the contest of life.

ORGANIZATION OF

THE PERIODS OF AMERICAN HISTORY.

PERIOD OF THE GROWTH OF LOCAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Relation of Discoveries and Explorations to this Period.

Not a Coördinate Phase of Institutional Life. — The separation of our history into the great phases given above does not include as one of its parts the discoveries and explorations that opened up America to Europe. A division made by searching for differences in the growth of institutional ideas cannot recognize these events as constituting one of its organic parts. They do not mark a movement in the thought of our people, for the ideas that called these events into being were European and hence belong primarily to the domain of general history, or to the history of their respective nations. If the separation into parts be made to rest, as is customary, on differences in events, then discoveries and explorations would constitute one of the main periods in American history. It does not follow, however, that, with the fundamental basis developed in the preceding discussions, there is no place for these events in our history. On the contrary, their rank in the subject is determined by the same method that fixes the

rank of any other series of events. If they touch the development of American institutions in any appreciable way, then they have some rank, but what particular rank must be determined by the amount and kind of this connection.

Their True Connection and Rank. — In general it may be said that the discoveries and explorations of the different European nations tended to fix the place where each planted its institutions in America. The place where ideas and institutions grow influences their development. Climate touches human life in many ways, determining animal and plant life, affecting the production of food, clothing, and shelter, and influencing population and social customs. The presence or absence of a fertile soil, rich mineral deposits, and navigable lakes and rivers gives bent to industrial life, and through this reaches into the domain of politics. For these reasons the student must take some account of the place where a new France, a new Spain, and a new England are to grow and do battle for existence.

For another reason the place of discoveries and explorations must be noted: the claims to ownership of soil were based upon these events, and out of overlapping claims came much of colonial history that shaped the course of future events. Our organizing principle makes us say, then, that the process of interpretation for a voyage of discovery and exploration consists in showing how it tended to fix a place for the growth of a group of institutions. This same principle makes it clear that the expedition having most to do in fixing or extending this region is the most important one in the series belonging to a given

nation. To put it in another way, it may be said that the teacher, in order to direct his pupils intelligently, must know two things about each event in such series: (1) what the event contributed to the claims of the nation sending out the expedition; (2) how the work of this expedition compares with that accomplished by others.

In settling these points, no doubt questions like the following will arise in the teacher's mind: Shall the student be permitted to learn only the bare facts about the voyage of Ponce de Leon? Our organizing principle does not exclude any knowledge of this voyage that enables one to understand how it tended to confirm or extend Spanish claims. But whether the Fountain of Youth ought to be studied in connection with this voyage is determined by its bearing on the confirmation or extension of Spanish claims.[1]

What ought to be done with the great expedition of De Soto? The organizing idea of history forces each teacher to ask this question: Did De Soto's expedition touch directly or indirectly the growth of our institutions? The answer is that it did so, very remotely, by confirming and extending Spanish claims to territory in North America. Very well, then, our principle directs us to study this expedition until the extent of De Soto's contribution is determined. But what about De Soto's wife left as Governor of Cuba, the number of vessels in his fleet, the number

[1] The pupil's interest in this beautiful legend may be an argument for its study at some time, but this interest offers no argument for its finding a place in the study of Spanish claims: it must stand or fall by the test applied to all events.

of mail-clad knights, of priests, of horses and hogs on board, the number of Indian fights and the results of each? Must the student learn and recite all these? They are all down in some of the books and serve to keep the class interested. It all depends on the relation of these incidents to Spanish claims to territory in North America. If they bear on the solution of this problem; if they aid the pupil to see more clearly what this expedition did for Spain, then they must be noticed — it may be, only noticed. The same principle will apply to the voyages of other nations that planted institutions in North America.

From the nature of the case, English explorations have a closer connection with our history than those of other nations. Our institutions have grown out of English ideas, in the main, and in the place which English voyages prepared for them. For this reason, though comparatively fewer in number, they should be studied with more care than the voyages of other nations. There seems to be an exception in the case of the first voyage of Columbus. His first voyage, historically speaking, was a world-voyage having much significance for other nations as well as for Spain. Hence, it must occupy high rank in this preliminary part of our history.

From the fact that the discoveries and explorations, taken as a whole, have, comparatively, only a small influence on the growth of our institutions, they cannot be erected into a coördinate part of the history of the United States; but because of their immediate relation to the localization and planting of European ideas in America,

they of right constitute an introduction to the period that deals with the transformation of European ideas into colonial institutions.

Non-American History. — Attention has been called to the fact that not all the voyages to America belong in the category of American history. In fact, much time may be easily wasted in a study of events that are really no part of American history unless one takes a very mechanical view of history, and holds that all events occurring in America form a part of its history. This would make the history of the North American Indians a part of American history, but certainly no one will say that in any truly historical sense did Indian institutions flow into or become a part of American institutions. And yet it is no uncommon thing for a teacher to be found earnestly at work teaching the history of the North American Indian without any conception of the proper limit of such study. The same is true of Mound-builders and the theories of their origin and modes of life. Nor do the ordinary texts give much guidance. None will deny the deep interest that attaches to these subjects, but the charm of interest cannot be the basis for passing judgment upon their position as facts in American history. There is but one test, the relation which they sustain to the growth of American institutions. The extent to which they influenced our history is the true measure of their value. When any fact is taught about explorations, Indians, or Mound-builders, which has no connection with our institutional life, such a fact is in the field of non-American history.

The Period as a Whole.

What Constitutes a Period. — It has just been shown that a series of events, discoveries, and explorations does not constitute a period. What does constitute one may be inferred partly from preceding discussions, but something more definite is now needed. The period or epoch is the largest and most complex historical division. Fundamentally, it is one of the coördinate phases of institutional growth which unite to make up the totality of a people's life. A period exists by virtue of the fact that a great movement in the life of the people dominates events for a given time. This epochal movement sets off its own time and events from those which precede and those which succeed it; it is, therefore, a differentiating idea. Were it not so, periods would be, in relation to each other, mere artificial inventions depending upon, and varying with, the whim of the writer or teacher. Not only does the dominant movement do this, but it also forms the common content of the facts of its own period, and thus performs the function of integration. Fundamentally, an event without this common content does not belong to the period, even if it occurs within the usual chronological limits of that period. On account of the loose thinking usually done in history, such a statement may seem entirely erroneous. It is only in history that groups and classes of entirely dissimilar facts are permitted.

Nature of this Period. — We have found already that the stream of American institutional life exhibits three great

and striking phases, and that the first of these is marked by being mainly concerned with the rise and growth of local institutions. From the manner of settlement the ideas and customs out of which these institutions grew were planted in groups more or less isolated, and throughout the period there was little inter-communication. The physical barriers to this were very great. The distance between settlements was immense, especially if measured by our present standards. Rivers, mountains, dense forests, savage beasts, and more savage men were almost insuperable obstacles to coöperation, even if the disposition had existed. To this must be added the very slow means of travel which in those days separated colonial capitals by thousands of miles, as we estimate travel. In the early part of the period, little conscious need of communication between governments arose except in New England. Direct official connection with England tended to prevent communication among the colonies on political matters. For the most part, politics was entirely a matter of local concern. Therefore this is the period when the forms and functions of local self-government had full and free development, when the government of the American town and township, county and state had their genesis. The same tendency prevailed in religious affairs, each colony following the dictation of local considerations. In fact, religious differences emphasized the isolation of colonial institutions, for the spirit of persecution was not entirely absent. Similarly, each colony followed its own ideas and prejudices in matters of education and social life.

Perhaps commerce was the only thread that bound the colonies together, with the feeling that, independently of all external dangers, each produced something which the other wanted. In addition, it may be noticed that the people felt the tie of race, especially when thinking of themselves in relation to Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Indians. But this feeling came only in times of external danger. Whatever germs of connection and union may have existed in this period were overshadowed by the facts and conditions of institutional isolation. Preëminently, then, it was an age for the development of local interests and institutions; and we may safely conclude that the origin and development of such ideas and institutions is the organizing idea of this period.

The Organizing Idea at Work. — It has already been explained as an important principle of organization that the differentiating and the integrating idea must be identical; that is, the idea which separates this period from the other parts of our history must be the idea that unites all the parts of this period into a whole. This we have already found to be the growth of local institutions, mainly out of European ideas and customs. It is this idea, seen as the content of the leading facts of the period, that interprets and integrates them, that puts meaning into them and joins them as a whole. It is this same idea that furnishes the standard for determining the relative value of the events of the period, thus giving them coördination and subordination as parts in an organic whole. To illustrate, we may say that the work of John Smith and Roger

Williams has the historic content common to all the events of this period; that each contributed to the growth of one of the groups of institutions. This identity of significance makes them a real part of the period. But how their work ranks in the period and with reference to each other depends entirely upon the relative amount and kind of each man's contribution.

Phases of the Period. — The content which the organizing idea of this period as a whole puts into its facts is too general to be alone sufficient for detailed work. It is necessary, therefore, to subdivide the period and search for more specific and concrete organizing ideas. It must be ever in mind that the real parts of a period are to be found by looking for differences in its organizing idea — differences, in this instance, in the growth of local institutional ideas. A careful and discriminating study of life in this time will reveal three forms pretty well differentiated. They do not, however, result from progressive evolution, but are, rather, three parallel streams of institutional ideas that run throughout the entire period. It is discovered that these differences coincide in the main with the familiar geographical regions of colonial times. It may be stated, then, that in New England there was a movement toward a general diffusion of rights and privileges, while in the southern group the predominance of growth was in the opposite direction, toward the centralization of rights and privileges. In the middle group there was a partial blending of the two movements.

The Diffusion of Rights and Privileges.

Why the New Differentiation is Made. — These differences in the growth of local institutions are not discovered for their own sake merely, but that they may serve the mind further in the process of organization. It is to this end that all separations — analyses — are made in any science, for it is only by this process that deeper and more perfect integrations — syntheses — are possible. Analysis, alone, may annihilate a subject, reducing it to mere isolated fragments. Isolation is death. To avoid this, and to attain the highest result as to discipline and knowledge, the act of synthetic organization must invariably follow. In the present case each phase of local colonial life must be organized under a new and more concrete principle. What this new idea is was found when the period was divided into its three great phases of institutional life. If life in New England is differentiated from that in other groups by a movement tending to the diffusion of rights and privileges, then this same idea must connect New England life into a whole. If diffusion was really the method of growth for New England, an examination of its history will show events in the main conforming to this law ; the most important events relating to government, religion, industry, and social life will be seen to come out of, and pass into, this great movement toward a fuller and freer participation by the people in the affairs of these institutions.

The Organizing Principle in the Concrete. — Let us look at some of the leading facts of New England history to see if they contain this principle. The charter of the Massachusetts Bay colony gave twenty-six persons almost unlimited power — they could have established an aristocracy or have taken great strides toward a democracy. Before leaving England with this charter, other persons, by vote of its members, were admitted to the rights and privileges of the corporation. In 1631 suffrage was extended to approved church members. New Haven was the only other colony in the group that extended the privileges of voting no further than to church members, while in early Rhode Island the right was exercised by all men. In 1632 the settlers at Watertown refused to pay taxes levied by the assistants. This led, in 1634, to the establishment of representative government in Massachusetts by giving the towns the right to elect the members of that part of the General Court which finally became the lower house of the colonial legislature. In 1635 Massachusetts made her judiciary more popular by establishing local courts, whose sessions were held in the various towns. About this time was legalized the town meeting, the most democratic institution of that age. In respect to most of these points, the other members of the group — especially Connecticut and Rhode Island — were even more progressive. In 1641 Massachusetts established the famous Body of Liberties, — a sort of Magna Charta, as was said. This document was passed by the General Court and was submitted to the towns of the colony, and is remarkable for the advanced

ideas set forth as to the rights of individuals. Connecticut and New Haven also framed very liberal constitutions. These facts seem to indicate that this organizing principle will hold for the growth in political thought. The existence of a party in Massachusetts in favor of the ideas of Roger Williams and Mrs. Hutchinson [1] proves a movement toward differentiation in religious thought, and the fact that many who did not agree with them did not favor their banishment proves a tendency toward toleration. This same tendency was stronger at the time the Quakers were punished, and had much to do in causing the authorities to stop their persecution, and in the witchcraft delusion public sentiment opened the prisons and cheated the gallows of some of its victims. This sentiment ultimately led Massachusetts to make reparation to the descendants whose ancestors had suffered in the persecution of the Quakers and the so-called witches. And later, both Massachusetts and Connecticut relieved Quakers and Baptists from ecclesiastical dues. In Rhode Island there was always more generous religious fellowship among sects than in Massachusetts. The Puritan church organization was thoroughly democratic. The local congregation was sovereign. There was no appeal from its decision. The centralization of religious authority in Pope or Bishop was antagonistic to everything Puritan. Many other facts of New England's religious life can be adduced to demonstrate that in the sphere of this institution there was growth under this

[1] The parties to these controversies were all Puritans — a fact that is generally overlooked in most of our text-books.

great law. If we turn to the subject of education, there, too, will be seen conformity to the same dominating idea, for in no other department of the people's life was the law of the diffusion of rights and privileges more perfectly expressed. The New England public school! That of itself tells the story. No other institution in its day did so much to bring the same opportunity to every man's child. The founding of the college and the establishment of the printing-press were other facts that point in the same direction. But what of industry? Did it, too, push Puritan life in the same general direction? To begin with, there was no concentration upon any one occupation. Soil, climate, mode of settling, the presence of the sea, and the great forest filled with timber and animals — all favored variety of occupation. This resulted, naturally, in the distribution rather than in the concentration of wealth; at least it gave equal opportunity and a just return for labor. The Puritan family in England was freer from the coloring of aristocracy than any other, yet, on removing to America, it brought many an English custom. But the great movements indicated were powerful social levelers. Puritan legislation began to grow in a new mold, and in 1641 the Body of Liberties struck some severe blows at the English method of transmitting property.

The truth of our organizing idea of New England history seems to be sufficiently attested by every great feature of that historical group, as far as New England could control her own destiny; and we may safely take it as the great central idea of this colonial group. It is this idea that the

student must find in the individual facts of New England history. In order that the case may be put more concretely, let us ask what the student must search for in the Roger Williams affair. In the first place he must see this episode grow out of the great movement that has been described above, — must see Roger Williams and his few friends as representatives of a liberal movement in religious and political ideas coming in contact with the old order of things as represented by the authorities of the colony. In the second place the student must discover how this conflict promoted the movement toward diffusion. In wading through the details of the controversy he must look for a tendency in public sentiment to either accept the new views or to tolerate the presence of their author. This conflict could not leave Massachusetts where it found her — there had to be growth. No doubt this latter phase of the event's content is the more difficult to discover, but it must be remembered that it is also the more important part of the content — more important because without it the degree of progress cannot be measured.[1] It is the new trend given to thought and feeling that enables the historian to take note of progress. When the leading facts of New England's life have been thus interpreted and we see in them essentially the same idea, the mind has joined them

[1] It is passing strange that most writers and most students have taken this event to prove how narrow and illiberal Puritanism really was, and in so doing have shut their eyes to the greater fact that it demonstrated its recuperative or progressive power as much as its conservatism.

into an intelligible whole due to the inherent force of a great dominant idea. And when each fact is measured as to the extent and degree of this content, we may say that each fact has taken its appropriate rank in the whole — that each is seen in its true historical perspective.

Principle Governing the Conduct of New England toward English Authority. — The events organized above belong to the internal development of New England. There are other events growing immediately out of the relations between the colonies and the mother country. In whatever form the conflict of authority between them expressed itself, the New England colonists were determined to preserve and increase their rights and privileges. It was a principle of action, always more or less consciously guiding them to exercise as much power as possible and to resist all encroachments upon it. This is clearly seen in the first great controversy between 1634 and 1636, when, on account of charges against the colony, Massachusetts was ordered by an English court to surrender its charter. The Governor and Council refused to make answer, while the ministers of the colony resolved that "we ought to defend our lawful possessions." The General Court, or colonial legislature, ordered that new forts be erected, and that the people be trained in the use of arms. The danger was averted by the crisis in England, and did not return till 1646, when the Long Parliament held sway. This body claimed the right to reverse the decisions of the colonial legislature, and also to give to Massachusetts a new charter. Both of these claims were viewed as aggressions by the

colony, and were so strongly opposed that parliament did not push matters to a crisis. Soon after the Restoration Charles II. sent orders to Massachusetts to remove the religious qualifications for suffrage, permit the English Church to hold meetings, and to have all legal documents run in the king's name. There was so much opposition to these changes, and some were made so reluctantly, while others were not made at all, that royal commissioners were sent over in 1664. News of their coming having reached Boston, the colonial authorities ordered a fast, a committee was given charge of the charter, the trainbands were authorized to practice, and other military preparations were made. The opposition to the work of the commissioners prevented any encroachments upon chartered rights. In the battle of the New England colonies for their charters, and in their temporary defeat in the days of Andros, the same principle of action controlled the people and their authorities. Their fidelity to it is exhibited in the overthrow of the authority of Andros and the rapid return to their former governments. In all conflicts of crown officials with the people between 1700 and 1750, the colonists of New England were true to the principle announced above.

Therefore, for the series of events growing out of the relations between New England and the mother country, the determination of the colonists to preserve, and, if possible, increase their rights and privileges, becomes the organizing idea. The teacher will note that this idea and motive will be found as content in all the events entering into the series, and also that this series as a whole organizes

into proper relations, with the series of events embodying the diffusion of rights and opportunities. This latter we have seen to be the principle of their domestic development, and it was for the preservation of this internal life that the fierce opposition to England's encroachments was made.

Centralization of Rights and Opportunities.

Nature of this Organizing Idea. — The above heading is taken as a statement of the most fundamental movement common to the institutions of the southern group of colonies. An attempt to organize the facts of southern colonial history around this idea will be found more difficult than the organization of New England history around the opposite principle. This difficulty grows out of the fact that the political life of the southern group was more frequently interrupted by conflicts of the people with the officials of the crown or with proprietors, and hence its political development was not left as undisturbed, and was not allowed to follow its natural tendency as completely as in New England. A practical difficulty also confronts the teacher or student who searches for events and facts bearing on the internal history of the group; for while most of our historians have been diligent in giving us pictures of the political collisions[1] mentioned above, they have not

[1] There is no doubt of the historical significance of these conflicts, for they tended to keep alive the spirit of opposition to encroachments on the rights of the colonies, but it must be remembered that they constitute only one phase of one portion of the people's life.

described very fully the events that attended the gradual absorption of power and influence by the slaveholders. This movement, by which political, social, cultural, and industrial opportunities were practically concentrated in the hands of the planters, was in the main a silent process. It went on, generation after generation, without obtruding itself upon the consciousness of the colonists; but it was none the less fundamental and permanent in its character.

General Causes of the Movement. — The soil of the southern colonies was exceedingly fertile, thus making agriculture so easy and remunerative that it practically became their one great occupation. No other occupation in this section could compete with it, and thus the opportunity for variety of labor was greatly limited. Besides, the warm climate made possible the production of certain plants, like tobacco, rice, cotton, and indigo. From the nature of these plants and their physical environment, the cultivation of them was simple; it could be performed by unskilled labor. These conditions made slave labor possible, and the great heat of the section made it seem desirable. The employment of the slave soon taught the planters that an increase in profit was to be gained by increasing the number of slaves. The result of this was an increase in the size of the plantation to give room for more slaves. The tendency of family pride was also in the direction of more slaves and more acres. The planters therefore absorbed the most desirable of the agricultural lands.

Economical Aspects of the Movement. — The first form of slavery was not negro slavery, but it was a system of

indentured service, by means of which the planters obtained white laborers for a term of years by paying their passage to America, or by buying their labor from companies who made a business of bringing over vagabonds and criminals. After his term of service the indentured laborer was turned loose — ignorant, poor, and often vicious — to shift for himself. These people furnished the beginnings of that class which, later, was the product of negro slavery — the poor whites. To the indentured servant after his contract expired, and to other non-slaveholders, three things were open: 1. They could be day-laborers, the easiest and most likely thing to be done. This, too, was the most hopeless thing that could befall the poor whites. In this sphere, they came into either direct or indirect competition with the negro slave. Not only did the presence of the slave give them less work to do, but for the part that fell to them the wages were small, from the fact that the cheaper form of labor was always present. 2. They could emigrate, and thus remove themselves from the immediate presence of slavery. Those dissatisfied could, and hundreds did, move out upon the frontier or up into the mountains, where lands were cheaper. They thus became independent farmers on a small scale. The more enterprizing settlers direct from Europe, not yet affected by contact with slavery, furnished by far the greater number of border farmers. But even this more ambitious class felt the unequal contest with slavery. The products of their more humble efforts had to go into the same market and compete with the products of the plantation — products

produced at the lowest possible cost. Their profits could not be proportionally as high as the planter's, because the labor that produced their tobacco or other products ate more and better food, wore more and better clothes, and required better shelter. If the non-slaveholders were still more ambitious, and if their knowledge was equal to their ambition, they frequently crossed the border into the northern or middle colonies, where disastrous competition was least felt. 3. Finally, it was barely possible, but not probable, that they might become slaveholders on a small scale.

There was little opportunity outside of agriculture. The sparseness of the population, the absence of towns and cities, and the consequent absence of the variety in occupation which gave encouragement to large numbers of intelligent and industrious laborers in the middle and northern colonies, compelled the non-slaveholder to labor in a field already too well occupied. Slavery gave the planter leisure, but it added to the time the non-slaveholder must work if he hoped to gain a competence or even the comforts of life. Slavery gave wealth to the planter, but denied it to the non-slaveholder. The tendency, economically, was to put the wealth of the colony into the hands of planters.

Social and Educational Effects. — Closely allied with the economic differences between those two classes was the contrast in their social life. In no other form of southern institutional life is the reign of the principle of growth, stated in the beginning, more strikingly apparent than in social life. The gulf between the family of the

slaveholder and the family of the non-slaveholder was often so wide as to be impassable. The immediate causes of this contrast in social standing are found in the fact that one family had wealth, leisure, and refinement, while the other was poor and had to labor, — conditions akin to slavery, — and was often marked by the absence of refinement and intelligence. On one side was family pride and many things to stimulate it — ancestry, acres, and slaves; on the other was a family often lacking in everything which constitutes the basis of family pride, with poverty often as deep as that of the slave, and even more pitiable, and with ignorance so dense as to be entirely unconscious. Naturally, there could be but little fellowship between families so widely separated by such social contrasts.

In the southern group there were few public schools such as were known in New England. In the absence of general and public means of education there was little opportunity for the non-slaveholder to educate his children. He might teach them the rudiments of learning, if perchance he knew them himself. If he was above the average non-slaveholder in point of wealth, the parson or some indigent scholar might be found to tutor them. The rule was that neither was found. Sometimes a substitute was discovered in the person of an indented servant. But all these results were only a few drops in the great ocean of ignorance. Thus it seems that the lack of education was a means to perpetuate the condition of the non-slaveholder. How could he rise? Where was his leverage?

In contrast with this, the children of the planter could have an education if their desires ran in that direction. Many of them had private tutors. Some went to the College of William and Mary, others to northern schools, while the more wealthy and ambitious went abroad for their schooling. This disparity between the two classes in education had much to do in perpetuating social and other differences. In view of this condition of the two classes, we may safely say that the principle of concentration finds another powerful confirmation.

How the Principle Worked in Politics and in Religion.— With all these differences of wealth, family position, and education, it is not only not a matter of surprise, but was the most natural and fitting thing that the slaveholders should receive all the political offices. They were, and it was practically necessary that they should be, the recipients of political preferment at the hands of the crown and also at the hands of the people. No other class in this group could furnish men who could measure up to the needs of colonial government as closely as the slaveholders. But besides the question of fitness, their social position, wealth, and possible influence would have gained for them political recognition. It was not unnatural, that with political power mainly in their hands they should be tempted to use it to promote their own interests. This was accomplished in many ways; but the most effective was the requirement of a given land qualification for suffrage, and a larger one for office-holding. In some instances, the tax on personal property was heavier, in proportion, than that on real estate.

Add to these the custom of the crown or proprietor of appointing only persons of high degree to places in the upper house of the colonial legislature, and we have all the conditions for the concentration of political power and influence in the hands of one class.

We thus see that each phase of institutional life, except religion, has been tested in the light of this principle of growth and has in the main confirmed the position assumed in the beginning. How about religious thought and feeling? Do they grow under the same law? So far as social and political interests touched religious customs and machinery, the tendency was to put their control in the hands of the aristocratic element. The English Church was the dominant organization in this group of colonies; and its influence was not, generally, such as would destroy this tendency, even if it did not purposely strengthen it. There were, in many cases, limitations placed on the exercise of free religious opinion, and even when dissenters were allowed to organize churches they labored under the disadvantage of competing with a church that either was supported directly, or was encouraged by the colonial government. There is, therefore, in these limitations on religious rights and privileges something akin to what we have witnessed in the other great institutions.

The peculiarity of all sides of life in the southern colonies, which we have been studying, did not, as might be expected, unfit the slaveholders for active and aggressive work in the Revolution. The love of personal and political independence was as strong as it was in the feudal

lords that snatched English liberty from King John. And in the southern colonies, where the favors of the crown did not stifle it, this old spirit flared up as quickly as in the more democratic regions of New England. The slaveholders formed the backbone of the Revolution in the South, and did much to marshal the non-slaveholders in defence of freedom. There were some features of the war that were not found in the North, but the centralization of power and privilege did not seriously check its progress in the southern section.

Conclusion. — The above discussion is historical rather than pedagogical. It has, however, this bearing on the process of thinking: by it we have demonstrated the existence of a law of growth in southern colonial life, which law is to play the part of the "organizing idea" of the history of this group, at least so far as internal influences are concerned. This "concentration of power and opportunity" is the idea that the student must keep with him in trying to investigate southern life in this period. This idea is to illuminate the facts of every phase of the people's life in this age, and these in turn are to enrich and give concreteness to this principle of historical development.

It may not be amiss to suggest here that in the light of the above discussion it is entirely feasible, and for many reasons very desirable, that the colonies be studied in groups rather than as isolated colonies. The student, in his first study, should, perhaps, take each one in detail, but a second going over the subject, if only in review, should be devoted to laying emphasis on the features common to

the members of the same group. This should be done for the sake of the knowledge as well as for the reason that time may be saved. The knowledge thus gained will have in it an element not to be had by studying isolated colonies; it will show the student that the great overshadowing features of life in one member were to be found in the other members of the same group. For purposes of historical interpretation this will entirely suffice. Why should the student be required to wade through a maze of dissimilar events only to find the same set of ideas? The value to the student of discovering the same idea in more than one set of particulars should be fully recognized, but there must be a limit to this unless great modifications are found in the ideas as the result of their varying embodiment. Such is not the case in the southern and northern groups. It seems that the principle of concrete expression of ideas and customs would be fully satisfied by selecting a representative colony of each group, say, Massachusetts for the northern, Virginia for the southern, and Pennsylvania for the middle group.

The Principle Governing the Attitude of the Southern Colonists toward English Authority. — As stated at the opening of the discussion on the law governing the internal development of southern institutions, historians have given much time to the events touching the relations between the colonial and the home governments. The cause producing these events is the frequent action of the mother country. This action, though frequent, was not continuous, hence ordinarily it is difficult to find a common and con-

nected content for these facts. This difficulty is not diminished by the nature of the events themselves, for they range over the whole list of possible occurrences. While this is true, yet if we analyze these events for the attitude of the colonial mind toward the exercise of English authority over them, we shall discover in the southern group the same state of sentiment as was found in New England, — a determination to exercise for themselves as much power as possible, and to oppose all encroachments, whether made directly by king and parliament, or indirectly by the colonial governors. This attitude is found in Virginia, when James I. took the charter from the London Company, when Charles I. made an effort to get control of the tobacco trade or sided with Governor Harvey, when Cromwell sent his war vessels and commissioners, and when Bacon defied the authority of Governor Berkeley. Likewise in the Carolinas, whether they were contending with proprietors under Locke's Grand Model, or contesting the aggressions of colonial governors appointed by the king, the same principle of conduct animated them. Because of her internal disturbances, Maryland presents fewer cases of conflict with king and governors than either Virginia or the Carolinas; but where cases of invaded rights were clear, the settlers of Maryland proved their right to be regarded as true Englishmen.

In discussing New England's relation to English authority, we found that the events connected therewith grew out of the people's efforts to maintain securely the institutional life of the group, especially as related to

politics, religion, and commerce. The same relation exists in the southern group between these two series of events. The opposition here was not for its own sake, but for the purpose of protecting the institutions of the colonies from dangerous encroachments which tended to limit the participation of the people in their functions.

The Middle Colonies.

Internal Institutional Growth. — The diversity of races, of religious and political institutions in this group makes it impossible to discover a dominant movement in colonial times for the group as a whole. Here we have a population foreshadowing that of our times. Here were the Dutch, Swedes, Germans, Scotch, Welsh, Irish, and English. Each was wedded to the ideas and institutions of his native land, and thus presented many barriers to the development of a characteristic tendency in internal affairs. New York partook, to some extent, of the characteristics of New England, especially late in the colonial period, but in its early days, Dutch influence was paramount; it did not, however, extend into other colonies. New Jersey and Delaware were much influenced by their proximity to the southern group, and the latter became a slave state. The conditions favoring diversity in Pennsylvania were so great that it had little in common with the other members of the group. Thus it appears that no law of development can be found for this group as a whole unless it be the law of diversity. This makes the organization of the history of this group as a whole quite unsatisfactory. No doubt

an analysis of the internal life of each colony would present some idea to serve as its organizing principle, but work so detailed hardly belongs to the scope of the present discussion.

Attitude of Middle Colonies toward English Authority. — While it may be difficult to discover an internal movement common to all the members of the middle group of colonies, it is not at all difficult to find the common principle animating the people of each colony with reference to extension of English authority. Particularly is this true of the two great members of the group, — New York and Pennsylvania. Almost from the day of their birth, the people of these two colonies were in conflict with their respective local authorities, whose functions and powers were drawn from royal authority. Sometimes the opposition was in the minority, but it kept on its struggle. In many cases the victory was only defensive, and simply held what had been gained, but from 1700 to the Revolution the people became aggressive and won real advances in rights and opportunities.

We thus discover that a common principle of action controlled the people of all the colonies in dealing with questions relating to the extension of British authority over them. This gives us a common interpreting and coördinating principle for all events falling under this category. Of course, with reference to the future, the discovery of this common content is full of significance, for it shows the gradual divergence of English and American political ideas, and that the spirit of the Revolution was born of a century or more of rough experience with English officials.

PERIOD OF THE GROWTH OF UNION.

The Period as a Whole.

The Transition from Isolation to Union. — The law of differentiation operating in history makes every age to some extent a period of transition. The law of continuity, however, so controls the movement of the dominant idea that the growth of this idea may consist in merely passing from one stage of itself to another. But what may be termed transitions proper are changes marked either by the appearance of new ideas and sentiments, or by growth in the old ideas to such an extent that the changes practically amount to new movements. These transitions proper are most marked on the border lines between periods, and are usually characterized by events whose content partakes of both the old and the new movement.

The transition in the present case marks the passage from the first to the second of the great coördinate movements in our institutional life. If the student is to be guided by the laws of growth he must search for the germs of the second period far back in the midst of the first. In the midst of isolation he must look for some signs of union. One of these, the tie of race, has already been mentioned. The English colonists felt that they were one against Indians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen.

Even in the first portion of the colonial era England made the Americans feel that her commercial interests and theirs were not identical. The renewal and extension of the navigation laws under Charles II., the creation of the Boards of Trade under William and Mary, the limitations on the woolen trade in the same reign, the passage of the importation act of 1733, and many other limitations upon colonial industry, tended to strengthen the conviction that the interests of the colonists and those of the mother country were not identical, at least in the eyes of British merchants and legislators. Out of these restrictions and this conviction, aided by the desire of gain, grew and flourished the colonial smuggling trade. American merchants and shippers troubled themselves very little about the moral questions, and soon there arose a loose sort of coöperation among the smugglers of the various ports; this was a germ of union that quickly developed into the merchant organizations of the Revolution. Another cause of the colonists uniting in thought and feeling against England, we have already found in the fact that, in all their struggles with governors, judges, and other royal officials, she stood against the claims of the people and supported those of the officials. While these contests over authority did not lead to any form of coöperation in the colonial time, yet they did create a state of mind which furnished a basis for union. Another thread of sympathy and coöperation existed in the first period, — dangers from the French and the Indians. These dangers were constant between 1690 and 1763, and were common to nearly all the colonies. That the English

colonies so felt is abundantly proven by the long line of intercolonial meetings covering this time, there having been more than a dozen conferences between representatives of various colonies; sometimes only the representatives of one group were present, but at one time or another all the colonies were thus in friendly coöperation. The immediate result of these conferences was a series of coöperative military and naval expeditions against the common enemy. In teaching the colonies the lesson of helpful and sympathetic coöperation in military affairs, the so-called intercolonial wars furnished the experience out of which a more perfect union might arise. In still another way, but indirectly, these wars and their attendant intercommunication prepared the way for union by breaking down to some extent the prejudices, religious and social, which various colonies entertained, and thus tended to remove some of the barriers to union erected in the period of isolation. These examples ought to be sufficient to prove that even in the period when local interests and institutions were dominant, new impulses were beginning to differentiate themselves from the prevailing condition and to move forward to the conquest of the future.

The Period Proper. — The real nature of the thought-movement of this period is foreshadowed in the lines of growth already indicated. It is indeed a movement from isolation to union. The preceding discussion, however, has not pointed out the special circumstances under which the impulse to union gained so mighty an impetus that it absorbed the energy of the whole people, and thus made

it the dominant movement of an era. The intercolonial wars left England apparently almost hopelessly in debt, and even before the close of the last one she began to devise means to raise a larger revenue in America. This determination led the custom-house officials of Boston to apply for writs of assistance as a means of breaking up smuggling. James Otis came to the rescue and made his great argument by appealing to the English constitution.[1] The result was regarded as a victory for all the colonies. The failure to enforce the old laws of trade led to their modification in 1763. This new law was a sort of confiscation act, because its most striking feature provided that the navy should be used to destroy the smuggling trade by confiscation of smuggled goods. It stimulated the cupidity of the naval officers, the governors, the judges, and the military officials by allowing them to share in the confiscations. Commerce with the West Indies was threatened with destruction. A storm of protests swept over to England. American commerce was greatly damaged, but England gained nothing. From now on, parliamentary legislation concerning America produced at each step the same results, — drove the colonies farther from England and closer to one another. The Stamp Act brought in its train colonial correspondence, a congress, non-importation

[1] In this speech Otis struck the "keynote" of the first phase of the American revolution. Lecky's *England*, vol. iii. p. 336, says that it excited great enthusiasm in the colonies. Extracts from the speech are found in Tudor's *Life of James Otis*, and in Mace's *Working Manual of American History*.

societies, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, and a whirlwind of indignation. The Tea Tax, the Massachusetts Circular Letter, the Boston Tea Party, the Boston Port Bill, and other events all produced similar results, — closer unity in sentiment, and greater coöperation in action. On this oneness of mind and heart independence rested for its declaration and its success. The growth of union and the success of the war were mutually dependent. This same sentiment gave existence to the Confederation, and as it waxed or waned, the Confederation was strong or weak. But the great process of unification went on and finally gave us the form of a nation, — the Constitution of the United States, the crowning event of the American Revolution.

Organization of the Period as a Whole. — The above brief examination of the thought and feeling of this period is made to show that an organizing idea in history is not an arbitrary whim or invention, but is a real, vital thing to be discovered by probing into the very essence of the facts to be organized, is a scientific induction drawn from a most careful and penetrating analysis and comparison of the facts observed.[1] It will be noticed that this examination confirms what we saw when dividing our history into its great coördinate parts, and also what was seen above when tracing the evolution of this period out of the life of the preceding, — that the differentiating mark of this phase of our life is the growth of the sentiment of union. If the

[1] It is not intended even to suggest that the examination of the above events constitutes the process of induction necessary to reach the organizing idea.

results of these examinations did not mutually support one another there could be no organization. For this idea of union could not interpret the events of this period, if it did not at the same time set them off from the events of the other periods. This is a test which must be satisfied by the organizing principle of science; otherwise it cannot lay claim to the function of such an idea. The ultimate test, of course, comes in the process of interpretation, when the student is carefully searching for the content — for the true significance — of the individual facts. If the induction is a true one this detailed and painstaking search will only reveal in this period the idea of union in greater fullness. It is finding this identity of content in the series of events called the Revolution that enables the mind to see it as an organically related whole. Here are events so widely different in aspect as almost to lose the student in the maze of differences, but under the direction of this idea of union we find them all akin. Identity of content is the only law of mind or of history that will enable the student to organize so many diverse facts into a logical historical whole.

The time between 1760 and 1789 was rich with events; and their systematic study as a whole must be carried further by measuring their relative value as a means to give them rank in the period. This is accomplished by comparing these events as to their relative contribution to the growth of the dominant idea of this time. Not only as a matter of knowledge but as a matter pertaining to the intelligent direction of others, the teacher must

answer such questions as this: Which event will give the student the deepest insight into the great movement toward unity in thought and action, — the struggle over the Writs of Assistance, the Stamp Act Congress, the Boston Tea Party, the battle of Lexington, the creation of the Confederation, or the ratifying conventions that established the Constitution? This question asked and answered for the leading facts of the Revolution will give them their true rank in the period, — their proper coördination and subordination in the series. The student will thus be able to view them in their true historical perspective. Then the period is no longer a chaos of facts, but each one stands in the place assigned it by its own historical significance.

The Phases of the Period. — As a means to a scientific knowledge of the period as a whole, there can be no doubt concerning the value of the general process of organization just explained. But the general idea of union, as the content for events taken singly or in groups smaller than that of the period, is not adequate, — is too abstract for purposes of detailed study and organization. This would leave the content of revolutionary events not only vague, but necessarily also the student's notion of the movement of union would be indefinite. Hence, for the sake of the organizing idea as well as for a more concrete content to give to individual facts, the idea of union must be pushed out into all its different manifestations — into all the shades of meaning that it took on in its process of evolution. To obtain this richer content we must appeal to another great function of our organizing idea — the division of the period

into its organic parts. In obedience to the principle of logical division, and in harmony with the laws of continuity and differentiation, we must find these parts by discovering differences in the growth of the sentiment of union. In casting the eye along the course of this mighty current between 1760 and 1789, there appear two general differences. In one part of the stream, thought and feeling are flowing in unison against England, while in the other, ideas and sentiments are moving toward agreement as to the proper relations between the states and the general government. Union against England dominated public sentiment from 1760 to 1783, and union on domestic questions had its beginning about 1775 and grew in intensity till 1789. These forms of union constitute the two great coördinate phases of the period of revolution. These two phases overlap, which is proof that the parts are historically true and were really organic forms of the people's thought, and not mere artificial inventions.

Union against England.

Organizes Events from 1760 to 1783 into a Series. — Since the idea of union against England differentiates the first from the second half of this period, it must also integrate all the leading facts of the first half. Union against England will be found as their chief common content. Whether we study the Massachusetts Circular Letter, the Congress of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, Washington's retreat through the Jerseys, or Burgoyne's campaign, the greatest common significance we

can find in them is the relation of union to them as cause and their reaction upon it as effect. The problem is not entirely solved when all the facts are thus traced into this great stream of public sentiment. These events must stand in the mind in orderly arrangement. If a true historical sense is to be developed in the student, they must be given rank on basis of their contribution to maintaining union against England. We see that this is a more concrete and definite organizing idea than the general idea of union. Perhaps it is possible to discover a still more substantial organizing idea. This can come, as we have often seen, only by discovering the inherent differences in the growth of the organizing idea, — in this case, union against England. A glance at this growth will reveal two contrasting phases: Union against England on the basis of the Rights of Englishmen, extending from about 1760 to 1775, and most fully expressed in the Declaration of Rights; and union against England on the basis of the Rights of Man, which extended from 1775 to 1783, and best expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

Union on the Basis of Rights of Englishmen. — The growth of union on the basis of the Rights of Englishmen is, in the order of time, the first phase of the American Revolution. To secure their rights as British subjects under the British Constitution was the animating thought that organized resistance to every measure of king or parliament aiming at an infringement of colonial privileges. It was the inspiration of this idea that first made Americans one in thought and sentiment, and concentrated their

efforts in every struggle from the Writs of Assistance to the battle of Lexington. The resolutions of town meetings and of colonial assemblies, petitions to the king and addresses to the English parliament and people by the Continental Congress, the organization and work of the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, the Committees of Correspondence, the Non-importation and Non-exportation societies, the passage of the Stamp Act, Tea Tax, and Boston Port Bill, the Boston Massacre and the Tea Party, either consciously aimed at, or unconsciously produced, a union to obtain the rights common to all Englishmen. The development of this sentiment, then, must be taken as the organizing idea for all the facts of this first part of the union against England. To trace the connection between these individual facts and this great idea — to see each of them producing it or produced by it, or both — is to interpret them.

A formal interpretation of some one of the events of this time may serve to make plainer the process by which a concrete organizing idea performs its work. Let it be a familiar one, — the Stamp Act Congress. The process of interpreting this event must follow the general principle already laid down, and therefore requires two things of the student: 1. That he show, if possible, the congress to be an outgrowth of union and coöperation already in existence. 2. That he show to what extent and in what way this meeting gave new impulses to thought and action directed to secure a united effort for the Rights of Englishmen. The student has seen this movement going on as the result

of a number of conflicts before the time of the Stamp Act. Besides, it was more than a year after the first news of the Stamp Act reached America that the congress convened. During this time he has been watching public sentiment take form. He has seen organized opposition begin in the towns, and has noted its transfer to colonial legislatures through instructions to representatives. From capital to capital, and from town to capital and back again, he has watched the news of agitation spread over the continent. This system of intercommunication he saw carry the burning words of Patrick Henry to every colony both North and South, giving courage and enthusiasm to all the people till a call for a congress resounded over all the land. By this process the student has been accumulating meaning for the congress, so that when he comes to it he is historically prepared for it. It stands to him as the expression of a great idea — an idea that moves profoundly the mind and heart of an entire people. The meeting of this congress is not to him an empty happening which might or might not have occurred; but he sees its vital connection with the public sentiment that gave it birth, and hence views it as an occurrence which is natural, if not necessary.

The work of this meeting must also be looked at from the point of view of its effects on the growth of union. Even the greatness of the men comprising the congress has this significance. The eminence of that body only gave greater impetus to the movement among the people. One of the marked features of the work accomplished was

that it came almost unanimously from their hands. This fact was of no small consequence, for agreement among the leaders made the rank and file harmonious. The Declaration of Rights — the most important document issued by the congress — was calculated greatly to strengthen oneness in thought and action because it gave to the struggle a constitutional basis. This document, distributed among the people, read, debated, and talked over, was not only felt to be a justification of what had been done, but was a powerful educator of the public mind as to the ground of resistance. The loyal and warm-hearted petition of the congress to the king touched a responsive chord everywhere in America; it truly expressed the sentiments of Americans toward their sovereign, and, taken with the Declaration of Rights, it showed how loyalty and love of liberty grow side by side — how loyalty does not mean servility, nor union treason. Thus we see that every important point connected with the congress touches the union to secure the Rights of Englishmen.

It is quite possible to put into the Stamp Act Congress a more specific and individualized content than union for the Rights of Englishmen, *i.e.*, union against internal taxation; but we have carried the process far enough for purposes of illustration. In the light of this process of organization, we see in this event a very perfect gradation of ideas. In the first place, beginning with the lowest degree of generality, the Stamp Act Congress expresses the immediate determination of the people to secure the repeal of the Stamp Act. The discovery of this idea in its

content makes this congress a member of a series of events that were means in trying to reach the same end. With this idea in mind for its content, it is a member of the smallest of the various series to which it belongs. Rising a step higher in the scale of generality, we found in the Stamp Act Congress an idea common to all great events between 1761 and 1775, — union to secure the Rights of Englishmen; here it becomes akin to the struggle over the Writs of Assistance, the Massachusetts Circular Letter, the Boston Tea Party, and the congress of 1774. In this same event we also found the more general idea of union against England; thus giving it place and meaning in a wider range of facts. It is now allied to the battle of Bunker Hill, the Declaration of Independence, Valley Forge, the treason of Arnold, and the surrender of Cornwallis. But this congress of 1765 contains the general idea of union — an idea that threads every great event of the American Revolution. In embodying union in its general form, the Stamp Act Congress strikes hands with the transformation of colonial into state governments, the Articles of Confederation, Shays' Rebellion, the cession of western lands, the formation of the Society of the Cincinnati, and the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Rising once more and finally in the scale of generality, we have in this event an idea that permeates all the facts of our history — the evolution of the life of the American people. What is true of this event is true of the period of the Revolution, and what is true of this period is true of our entire history: it can be organized into a Hierarchy of Ideas.

Union on Basis of the Rights of Man. — This is the second phase of the struggle against England, and has its origin when public sentiment begins to pass over from the Rights of Englishmen to the Rights of Man. The germs of this new basis of union are found in the preceding struggle. "The rights of man," "natural rights," and similar expressions are found in the speeches and writings of Otis, Henry, and in the documents of legislatures and congresses. The genesis of the new movement was greatly stimulated by the failure of the great efforts of Chatham and Burke at conciliation, and by the attitude of king and parliament toward the petitions of the congresses of 1774 and 1775. The congress of 1775 sent a final petition to the king by the hand of a good loyalist, Richard Penn. While waiting for the king's answer, the congress, in order not to prejudice the petition's reception, refused to undertake any measure looking toward independence. When, however, word came that the king refused to reply to the petition, proclaimed the colonists rebels, and provided for mercenary troops, the congress went forward rapidly with measures that looked toward independence. Lexington and Bunker Hill had already occurred, and the siege of Boston was in progress. Paine's *Common Sense* came in January, 1776, to add argument to the force of events in favor of separation. These and other events convinced the majority of the people that England would never grant their coveted English rights. This conviction forced them to contemplate a broader and a more generous basis of action, — the Rights of Man. The ripening of this

new sentiment produced the Declaration of Independence, — the best formulation of the Rights of Man ever penned.

In the winter and spring of 1776 various colonies began, with the advice of congress, to reorganize their local governments. New Hampshire and South Carolina were among the earliest to form a government based on the "consent of the governed." In April, 1776, North Carolina instructed her delegates in congress to coöperate with the other colonies in measures for independence. May 4th, Rhode Island disclaimed allegiance to the king, and instructed its delegates in congress to promote union and confederation. The great commonwealth of Virginia, in convention assembled, voted (May 15th) to instruct its representatives in congress to propose a declaration of independence, confederation, and foreign alliances. This action was transmitted to the other colonial assemblies. On June 12th the convention issued a "Declaration of the Rights of Man." Of course Massachusetts, in 1775, had overthrown the royal government. Thus the movement away from the Rights of Englishmen and forward to the Rights of Man went on till the summer of 1776, when the more conservative colonies could withstand the agitation no longer, and where the regular colonial authorities refused to instruct for independence, popular conventions assumed that function. The formal Declaration of Independence marks the triumph of the new basis of union in the minds and hearts of the American people. Its permanent triumph in institutional organization will be determined by the fortunes of war.

The enumeration of the above facts is not for the pur-

pose of tracing all the causes that gave rise to the change in American thought and feeling, but rather to show how union for the Rights of Man[1] becomes the dominant idea for the second phase of union against England. This also serves to show that our organizing idea in this new phase of the Revolution is not merely assumed or invented, but is the essence of that phase of institutional life which most completely absorbed the energies of the people for that time,—a movement so fundamental that the immediate past flowed into it, and the immediate future sprang out of it.

The Organization of Military Events. — After the declaration was made, most of the events connected with this phase of the Revolution were military in character. Even those not strictly military were more or less a means to the progress of the war. Battles and campaigns are a class of historical facts that have puzzled teachers and students. For a number of years less and less attention has been given to their study. Some persons urge their omission from text-books altogether. This is a natural reaction against the old-time view of history which made it consist largely of wars and the career of warriors. Such was, no doubt, a very one-sided and superficial view of the

[1] The expression "Rights of Man" really names more fundamentally the content of this movement than either "Independence" or "Separation." The latter are more frequently used, but the student must see that separation is likely to seem more of an act and less of a growth than the rights of man. Besides, independence is rightly viewed as a means to the realization of the rights of men in American institutions.

subject; but it may be safely held that the military side of history will never again dominate our books and our teaching. Persons who oppose the study of military events altogether generally do so on some ground outside the subject-matter of history. This may be a worthy ground of opposition, but it is one which method in historical study can hardly take into consideration, and so the question still remains: Have battles and wars no historical significance? Shall the battles of the Revolution have a place in our study? Most persons will answer this question affirmatively; but in order to understand the ground for the answer, this question must be asked: Did the battles of the Revolution have anything to do with the real Revolution? This can be answered only in the affirmative, thus giving military events a place in the study; but what place or rank is not indicated. For an intelligent understanding of the subject, as well as for pedagogical purposes, we need to determine more carefully what content and what value are to be given to such events in the study of this part of the conflict. This can be done only by the aid of the organizing idea of this part of the subject. The relation which the battles had to the sentiment of union in general, and to union against England for the Rights of Man in particular, is the standard to which we must appeal. It may be remarked that some think the Revolutionary War was the Revolution; but we have seen one phase of the struggle end before the war began. The battles of the Revolution were hardly a part of the real Revolution. They were the sign — the

external evidence — that there was a real revolution in the minds and hearts of the people; they were also the means by which the Rights of Man were secured — by which the advance in thought and feeling was made permanent. The relation between the war and the new form of union was, therefore, an intimate one. It may be stated in another way: the relation between them was one of mutual dependence; the success or failure of one was the most potent factor in giving strength or weakness to the other. Perfect coöperation and union among the people won victories, and oftentimes victories aroused their spirit to more hearty and enthusiastic support for the cause. Hence the rise and fall in the tide of public sentiment cannot be traced from 1775 to 1783 without some study of the military events of that time. But how shall we study a battle? What, for instance, is the problem to be solved in studying the battle of Lexington? Our organizing principles — union for the Rights of Englishmen and union for the Rights of Man — must give answer. How the sentiment of union, already in existence, tended to cause the battle, and how the battle in turn affected the spirit of oneness among the people. The student must see flowing into this battle all the preparations the colonists had made: the formation of committees of safety, the organization of minute men, the manufacture and storing of munitions of war, the establishment of means of rapid communication between Boston and the villages and country to enable them to watch the British and to alarm the country in case of danger. All these, and others like them, were

phases of the coöperation that made such a fight possible. The movement toward union, manifesting itself in these various ways, was the true cause of the battle, its character, and its immediate result. How much more meaning is given to this event by viewing it in this way than by seeing it as the result only of a purpose on the part of the British to destroy military stores! We now turn the battle towards its results and see how its content is enriched. First, let us see how not to do it. How this skirmish wrought up public opinion to so high a pitch is not to be discovered by trying to decide which party fired the first shot, nor by quoting the language used by Major Pitcairn as he bade the minute men lay down their arms, nor by trying to remember the number killed, wounded, and missing on each side. One might know all these facts, and many more of the accidental features of the affair, and yet not see the flame of indignation that swept over the land and made the people think and act as one man. A part of the answer to the problem of the battle of Lexington is to be found by seeing the response that came in the form of minute men from thirty Massachusetts towns before that day's work was over, and from all New England and the country at large in the days and weeks that immediately followed this contest. This answer is further to be read in the assembly of twenty thousand provincials around Boston, and in the patriotic resolves and energetic measures of the colonial assemblies, as they took up the burden of war. After this manner are we to interpret the battles of the war.

The interpretation of the above battle makes the problem in the study of a military event the same in kind as that connected with any other event. The historical significance of a battle can be obtained in no other way. To study it as a military event, or a war as a series of military events, merely; to view it as a student of military science, is to miss its true historical content. Because teachers of history and writers of text-books have persisted in trying to treat battles and campaigns as illustrations of military science, or have viewed them as mere external happenings isolated from the real life of the people, came the reaction against the study of battles. It is believed, however, that the method of interpretation suggested, and applied to the battle of Lexington, will go far towards giving military events their legitimate rank among historical data; but, in general, this view of their content will not permit them to hold their former rank.

The illustration given does not go far into details — only states the problem and points out the general plan of its solution. From the enumeration of only a few facts about the battle of Lexington the inference should not be drawn that none of the accidental features of a battle are to be studied. The battle, like any other external event, is a means and not an end; it was a means and not an end to the people who participated in it. It must follow that only such features of the battle or campaign are to be studied as will contribute to the end in view. No more definite law than this can be stated, because the accidental

features of a battle, the particular officers in command, the numbers on each side, the number killed and wounded, movements, condition of each army as to supplies and other munitions of war, and like points, bear no fixed ratio to the effect on public opinion. In a given battle or campaign, one set of features may account for a change in public opinion, while in another battle a different set of facts may have to be appealed to. Again, military events of similar proportions do not bring about corresponding changes in the ideas and attitudes of the people. The disparity in the results of battles may be illustrated by the skirmish of Lexington and the storming of Stony Point. To the student of military science, the latter has many points of interest, while the former has little to commend it to him. To the student of the institutional life of the people, the affair at Lexington is full of interest, while the attack on Stony Point has little value to him as a means of tracing the growth of ideas in the Revolution. It is true that this daring event has many unique and thrilling features about it, but their value ends in themselves, for they do not lead the student into the current of human passion. This illustrates the statement that there is no fixed relation, nor one permitting formulation, existing between a battle and the movement of public sentiment. The reaction in popular feeling caused by the actions at Trenton and Princeton was greater, in proportion to their size, than the depression produced by the series of disasters begun by the great defeat on Long Island and closed by the flight across the Jerseys. The

best that can be done, therefore, is for the teacher to keep before the student the problem to be solved, and, if necessary, to direct him in the preparation of his work, so that emphasis will be given to those features that throw most light on the problem.[1]

If the content of public sentiment in the form of union for the Rights of Man is searched for in all the military events of the time, the mind will group these facts into a series, on the basis of a common historical content; they thus become as much a part of the Revolution as any other event of that time. It must appear also, from the above discussion, that those military events contributing most to the end struggled for are the ones having the richest historical content, and must take highest rank in the series. If this standard of determining the relative value of events be applied to all the battles and campaigns of the war, the result will give about three grades of events: a very few campaigns to be studied in detail; a much larger number of battles whose significance can be obtained in a single reading; and a still larger number, including mere local skirmishes, whose content is so vague that they should not be studied at all.

During this second phase of the struggle against England we have seen that another series of events, more purely political in character, were taking place; they included the ordinary work of the Continental Congress, the Declar-

[1] It may not be amiss for the student in his reading to touch on the details of events which have no bearing on the problem in hand, but the teacher should not waste time in emphasizing them in recitation.

ation of Independence, the formation of state constitutions, foreign relations, the attempt to establish a general government on the basis of the Articles of Confederation, and other events of a like nature. These are to be interpreted and integrated by the same organizing idea that answered for the military events — union for the Rights of Man. The Declaration of Independence, as a document, gives the best formal expression of these rights. It embodies the ideas on which the struggle was to be waged, and on which it was to be justified to the Americans themselves and to the rest of mankind. The act of Declaration is evidence that new ideas had taken the place of the old basis of union. The enthusiasm with which it was received by the army and by the people attests the fact that union on the new basis was an accomplished fact; it also measures to the student the strength of the revulsion in feeling that had taken place between April, 1775, and July, 1776. From this time on the attainment of the Rights of Man becomes the conscious aim of the Americans. It is held by some that the dominant idea of any time is not always consciously present to the people of that time. This is not true of the people in the Revolutionary period. They had not only given up the hope of English rights, but had substituted a new ambition, and one full of inspiration. This is the ideal that animated their every act from the smallest to the greatest; it was a consuming passion with them. It seems to follow, then, that the student ought to put into the means used the same meaning which the people did themselves; but

this interpretation cannot be made unless the doctrines of the great Declaration are studied, here and now, in the very place this event occupies in the series of which it is a part. In the ordinary text-book, Richard Henry Lee's resolution holds a more prominent place than any part of the Declaration. This has given the impression that the former is of more importance than the latter. Few suggest any study of the Declaration. In trying to emphasize the need of studying the Declaration of Independence in this place, I do not mean to insist on giving more attention to the accidental features of this event, — the hall in which it was made, the handwriting of the document, the names of the committee that prepared and reported it, and other like points, — but rather that the student ought to be required to make a careful analysis of the political principles[1] found therein, so that the "rights of man" may mean something definite to him. The accidental features should not be ignored; but the teacher of history must constantly bear in mind the fact that the student may know all there is to be known of such features and still not know the real Declaration of Independence. There are two reasons for this study: it casts a new and fuller light on the events preceding the Declaration, — these events really caused it, — and their true and full meaning is not known till the things that were caused are understood; again, the events, both political and military, that followed the Declaration, are to be seen

[1] The portion of the Declaration preceding the enumeration of grievances is the part to be studied most at this point.

as means in the process by which it became possible for the ideas of the Declaration to become the foundation of our institutions. Thus, illuminated by the same great idea, the events between 1775 and 1783 become the members of a connected historical series.

It must follow without much question that the Declaration is by far the most important event in this part of the Revolution, and must, therefore, be given a large share of time. In truth, the idea of independence begins to push to the front with the battle of Lexington, and goes on throughout the entire series. The formation of the state constitutions will show how rapidly men's minds grew toward the ideas of the Declaration. In all the new constitutions these ideas are implied, and in a majority of them are formally expressed in shape of Bills of Rights. Wherever we turn, therefore, we meet with the new ideas.

Union of the States by means of the General Government.

The Organizing Idea of the Second Half of the Revolution. — The period of the Revolution is a period by virtue of the growth of the idea of union which permeated every act and fact of that age. We have already marked two great differentiating forms in the process of union; union against England, which constitutes the first half of the period, and union respecting the relation between the states and the general government, which constitutes the last half of the period. These two coördinate parts

are not cross-sections in the stream of Revolutionary thought and feeling, but are parts found running parallel through a portion of the period.

In the very beginnings of the Revolution the colonies were brought into new relations with each other. To promote and bring to a successful issue the combination against England required not only new and strange relations between the thirteen political units, but that these relations be made definite in order to promote harmonious and efficient action. No sooner had the Continental Congress convened than it had to determine the number of votes a colony should cast and the number of votes necessary to bind all the colonies. When the war opened, still other questions pertaining to intercolonial relations pressed upon congress, such as the number of troops, the amount of supplies, and the amount of money to be raised. How far shall the authority of the congress extend, and when shall the authority and machinery of the state government come into play? What regulations shall be placed on interstate commerce, and who shall place and execute such regulations? These questions and many other kindred ones arose out of the pressure of war. The Declaration of Independence also aided in forcing the question of domestic union upon the attention of the people. In fact, the committees to draw up the Articles of Confederation and the Declaration were at work at the same time, and the former made its report only a few days after the latter's work was done. As the war neared its close and the burdens of the struggle grew heavier and heavier, the question

of the proper relations between the states and the general government began to assume still more prominence. The efforts to pay the army, to make satisfactory commercial treaties with foreign nations, the disturbances over interstate trade, and the injury to American manufactures at the close of the war by the inflow of cheap British products, all kept the minds of the people constantly agitated as to the proper distribution of sovereignty between the states and the general government. The same problem confronted the Maryland and Virginia commissioners in 1785, and that still greater body of men who met at Annapolis in 1786 and called for a national convention. And what was the greatest problem before the convention of 1787, and also before the ratifying state conventions? Was it not the proper adjustment of the relations between the states and the nation?

The movement of public thought and feeling towards agreement on some principle of coöperation between the states and the general government is the organizing idea of the second half of the Revolution. It is the discovery of this idea as the common content of the events of this time that makes them into an intelligible series — makes them more than a mere time-and-place series. This cannot be done without a thoughtful effort; a mere reading over of the events and facts so as to picture them dimly in imagination or to hold them vaguely in memory will not suffice. It is not intended to suggest that memory and imagination have no part in this process of interpretation, for, in fact, they play a most important part. The

aim is to guard against the common error of believing that these processes reach the end in historical study. Even if the processes of imagination and memory were perfect, the student may not have found the connection between the events studied and the general principles of which they are the manifestation and which control them as the law of their being. The teacher must therefore see to it that the student discovers this movement as cause or as effect, or both, in the individual facts of that time, and that he distributes his time and energy among these events in proportion as they contributed to this great movement. Some gave little, some gave much, and they are to be judged accordingly.

Union on Basis of Sovereignty of the State. — Just as we have found public sentiment separating the question of the relation of the states to the general government on domestic questions from their relation to it on foreign questions, so it began soon to take different views of the kind of relation that should subsist between these two forms of government. The Declaration of Independence expressly asserted the sovereignty of the people of the thirteen colonies as a whole with reference to England, and by implication with reference to the rest of the world. Public sentiment was not divided by state lines on the question of independence ; but when the Articles of Confederation brought to the front questions involving the relations of the states to the general government on subjects that did not primarily touch the conflict with England, it was found in congress and among the people that no such unanimity

of sentiment prevailed as to the principle on which the relation should be permanently established. This difference caused the congress to delay over a year before adopting the Articles. It was found impossible to carry the principle of national sovereignty, which controlled, in the main, foreign affairs, into the domain of domestic questions; and the more public sentiment was sounded, the more it became evident that the states must be more or less sovereign in home affairs. From 1775 to 1785 the sovereignty of the state on internal questions was generally agreed upon, and for a part of the time was the legal principle of connection that regulated state and general governments in their internal dealing. This is the first phase of domestic union — the first part of the second half of the Revolution. The Articles of Confederation embody the progress made.

The growth of domestic union did not keep pace with union against England. In the first place, the colonies had been undergoing, for a generation or more before the Revolution, a change of feeling toward the mother country. This we saw in the study of each group of colonies. Besides, the first phase of union against England had to prove itself a failure as a means of obtaining a redress of grievances before the people could see the necessity of a permanent union based upon purely American interests. Of course no such union could arise so long as they were struggling for the Rights of Englishmen. The habit of coöperating against England was fifteen years old before the germs of permanent domestic union began to grow.

Again, from 1775 to 1783 the interest in the questions of domestic confederation were entirely secondary, as we have seen, and in many cases arose out of conditions which were likely to disappear with the return of peace. Perhaps many of these causes would not have retarded a vigorous growth of internal union after it had once taken root, but certainly two causes did so operate. One was the people's inbred jealousy of any authority that seemed to have even the appearance of centralization. This was not an unnatural fear, for they had no other experience and no other example than that offered by England. The other lies in the fact of the peculiar environment of the colonial era out of which the colonies were trying to emerge. The people were attached to their local institutions, and scarcely a man in 1783 loved America more than his colony or state. It was a most difficult problem to lead the people to repose a portion of their confidence and affection in a new system of government. For these reasons the Articles of Confederation could not and did not embody as high a degree of domestic union as did the Declaration of union against England. Theoretically and practically the states held more sovereignty than the nation so far as internal questions were concerned.

The sovereignty of the state is the dominant idea of this sub-period and gives historical continuity to its events and performs for the teacher the pedagogical functions of organization. This idea furnishes the main content for all the events of importance touching the relations between the states and the general government. It is the great idea

that controlled this class of events during that time; they came in obedience to it, and in turn reacted on public sentiment so as to modify this law of their being. The sovereignty of the state is the fundamental doctrine of the Articles of Confederation, and interprets them and the acts done under them. Whatever can be pointed out as defects in the Articles, and as failures in the administration under them, are to be interpreted by this principle and its corresponding sentiment. In fact all the defects in this instrument are there because this fundamental defect is there. They can all be reduced to it. Not only is this principle the interpreting idea for the defects of the Confederation, but for such facts as the discontent in the army near the close of the war, the lack of confidence on the part of some foreign nations, and the insolence of others, the financial and industrial depression, Shays' rebellion, and many others, are to be traced to this same principle as their sufficient cause and historical content. This process of interpretation results in giving to the student a series of unified facts. Not only will these facts stand in his mind as having a common content, but he will readily see that some of them contain more of this content than others. Thus this study enables him to give to each of these facts its true rank in the series. The knowledge of this by the teacher before the student begins the series will be of great service in guiding the work so as to secure economy of time and energy.

Union on Basis of Sovereignty of the Nation. — No doubt the careful student has observed, in the series of

events just studied, this difference: that although state sovereignty is the main content of these events so far as their cause is concerned, yet their effects often tended to draw the people away from this principle as the basis of government. This is particularly true of the events between the closing years of the war and 1786. We may say, then, that the student, observing one of these events, looks through it in two directions,—back toward state sovereignty as its remote or immediate cause, and forward toward national sovereignty as the effect it had on public sentiment. It is true that even the effects of these events are the negation of state sovereignty, and are, therefore, legitimately interpreted by it until the growth of public sentiment takes on a positive form and moves consciously toward the sovereignty of the nation. The genesis of a new idea is often found in the negation of some idea that is worn out or fails to meet the requirements of the changed circumstances arising out of new conditions. The old idea, on account of its inadequacy, causes a reaction in public sentiment against itself till this sentiment moves off in the direction of the new and opposing idea. This is just what took place in the transition from state sovereignty to national sovereignty, as the basis of union. The movement toward nationality was well under way by 1785 and 1786, and the current was neither turned aside nor broken after this point had been reached. The growing sentiment was becoming more conscious of the movement—not only of going away from the principle of the Confederation, but of moving toward a new goal. The struggle for

its formal attainment goes on with increasing force through the convention of 1787 and the ratifying conventions of the states in 1787 and 1788.

The Process and Material of Organization. — The suggestion has already been made that in the first phase of domestic union many of the facts pointed to a new form of union, and must be so interpreted. We do not violate, but obey, a law of historical growth when we connect with the new growth some of the events that were found to be members of a different series on the basis of a different idea. When the student is interpreting events in the light of the idea of state sovereignty, the teacher should lead him to discover the tendency of the new movement as it now and then appears in the midst of other effects. This is necessary in order to compass the full significance, not only of the facts, but of the principle itself. What an idea like state sovereignty is potentially can only be discovered by watching it transform itself through external facts into reality, even if a part of this reality is the negation of the principle itself. If this method of interpretation is observed in transitional periods, or when two lines of thought run parallel and mutually influence each other, as soon as the new idea becomes the dominant one, the student already finds himself in partial possession of its beginnings. It is well at this stage to run back over such events with attention resting solely on their significance with reference to the new idea. It may aid somewhat if we now gather up some of these facts which the idea of national sovereignty either partly or completely interprets.

As far back as 1776 the idea of a national government was suggested by Thomas Paine, and also by Rutledge of South Carolina. But the first years of the war so unified public sentiment and effort that the defects of the form of government did not appear in their completeness till near its close. In 1780 the idea met with frequent individual and public expression ; the Boston convention of New England delegates, and, later in the year, the Hartford meeting of New England and New York delegates, called for a new government and sent a circular letter to the states and to Washington. In the same year Hamilton wrote his famous Duane letter; in 1781, a series of papers called the *Continentalist*, a name suggestive of nationality ; also a plan for a national bank. Paine renewed his old suggestion. In the next year Washington took a hand in the agitation, and wrote to many prominent men urging the need of a new constitution. Twice during this year congress called for larger powers from the states, and a pamphlet argued for a congress to frame a new government; in 1783, the New York legislature was moved to ask congress to call a convention to revise the Articles of Confederation. At this time it became fashionable in the army and in the taverns and coffee-houses to drink the toasts : "A hoop to the barrel," and "Cement to the Union." The formation of the Society of the Cincinnati, the agitation over the cession of western lands, and the proposal of an impost by congress also aided in molding public sentiment. This agitation extended over the next year, and to it may be added the influence exerted by Noah Webster's essays in favor of stronger government.

By the time 1785 is reached we may say that the current was setting strongly toward nationality. The business men of New York city called for adequate powers for congress; the merchants and mechanics of Boston addressed congress and the state legislatures to urge that the former be given power over commerce; the merchants also opened correspondence with other commercial centers to enlist them in the cause. Governor Bowdoin addressed the General Court on the question and suggested a convention of the states to consider the subject. The General Court resolved in favor of such a convention and instructed the governor to communicate with other executives, and directed their delegates in congress to move in the matter. In this same year the people of Pennsylvania, through a popular convention, demanded more power for the general government, and later in the year the governor and council called for a new constitution. Early in this year of healthy agitation the commissioners from Maryland and Virginia met at Alexandria, and, with the advice of Washington, agreed to uniform rules for their trade — a work which suggested the desirability and the necessity of a wider application of common commercial regulations.

In 1786 came the Annapolis convention with wider representation and with aims still more national than the Alexandria meeting. Hamilton wrote the convention's report, calling for a national convention to revise the Articles of Confederation; this was widely circulated and commanded the attention of thoughtful men in all parts of the country. In the winter of 1786 and 1787

New England was shaken to its center, and the rest of the states startled, by the insurrection of Shays; this made men and states willing to go to a national convention who otherwise would not have gone. The mutterings of discontent were coming over the mountains from Kentucky and Tennessee; already the Spaniards had seized goods of westerners on the lower Mississippi, and General Clarke at Vincennes had retaliated and was thought to be preparing to attack the Spaniards. These events were rapidly consolidating public opinion in favor of the great convention that was to meet at Philadelphia, and no doubt forced Washington to reconsider his refusal to be a delegate. The state conventions to ratify the constitution, and the events that were preparatory to them, constitute the last series in the great movement towards national sovereignty as the basis of union. They are also the last acts in the drama of the American Revolution. With their consummation, the form of a nation comes into being.

The Limit to the Process of Organizing a Period. — With the close of the period under discussion, the more formal treatment of historical organization ceases; therefore the question of the limit of this process as applied to periods may be properly raised at this point. While no limit to this process has been assigned in preceding discussions, it is really inferred from the nature of the process itself that it must of necessity come to an end when a content has been found so specific and particularizing as to belong to one event only. With

this content alone in consciousness, the event or other fact stands in mental isolation, or as nearly so as can be. This must be, for we have seen over and over that resemblance in content is the only basis of organization. Without it there is no integration, and likewise no coördination and no subordination; for there exists no common standard for testing the relative value of events, therefore no ranking can occur. This sort of content has little value except to give concrete and individualized details. It must not be inferred, however, that concrete details have no organizing power. Whether or not they have depends upon the power of teacher and student to trace general principles or phases of institutional growth into concrete details. Nothing can be more concrete and individualized than the ideas of some one particular man, as Roger Sherman in the convention of 1787. And yet this concrete and individualized embodiment may, at the same time, be the sentiment of a majority of the country; it is none the less concrete because found elsewhere, and not the less universal because found in the heart and mind of a given man. The isolated concrete fact, while not more concrete than the example just given, has less historical value, because it cannot aid in the interpretation of other concrete facts like itself. When, therefore, the interpretation of an event proceeds until isolated content is all that is obtained, the process ought to cease.

But between this extreme limit and what has been done with this period in passing from the most general

idea of union down to the four coördinate and more concrete forms of union, there may be found several other shades of thought and feeling in each of these forms. For instance, this can be done easily for the first form of union extending from 1761 to 1775. No doubt union to secure the Rights of Englishmen was differentiated by public opinion into the various elements that entered into the people's conception of English rights, such as trial by jury, right of internal taxation, and finally the right to resist even external taxation under the guise of the tax on tea. Each of these ideas may be found as the content of a smaller series of events than the series unified by the Rights of Englishmen. In a similar way it is quite possible to discover phases of thought and feeling in the growth of union on the basis of Rights of Man, the sovereignty of the state, and the sovereignty of the nation. These more specific and possible forms of thought and feeling will not be discussed at length for the reason that it is the aim to illustrate the nature and principles of the process of organization rather than to deal with historical material as such. It is believed that the organization of the period of the Revolution has been carried far enough to enable the teacher and student to push the process into the more specific phases already indicated.

The Result. — If the teacher has guided the student through the period by the light of the principles of organization, the result, on the side of knowledge, should stand as follows: 1. The facts and events of the Revolution

stand in his mind united into a series by the presence of a common idea — the growth of union; some facts stand out with great fulness, while others fade out of importance till they have hardly a rank or place in the series. 2. His view of the ideas and events of this period as a whole gives two parts, two great series, each with its members joined and ranked by phases of the growth of union. In the first of these two series, the animating idea is union against England, and in the second, it is union on domestic questions. 3. A closer inspection will show that the student has broken each of these phases of union into two parts and reorganized each part into a new series on a new basis; union against England and its events are separated into two parts: union for the Rights of Englishmen, and union for the Rights of Man; union on domestic questions and the events attending it are separated into union on basis of state sovereignty, and union on the basis of national sovereignty. Thus the period stands in the student's mind an orderly arrangement of ideas of varying degrees of generality. Each fact stands illuminated by a series of ideas rising from the lowest to the highest. Each fact has a lowest idea that isolates it from all others, and a higher idea that gives it fellowship with a series of like content, and so on upward through changing degrees of generality until the highest idea is reached, an idea that binds it to all the facts of the period.

Perhaps a concrete illustration of the idea of gradations of generality in the content of historical material may

serve to make it clearer. The Declaration of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution are four great cardinal facts in this period. Each of these contains a phase of thought that not only separates it from the others, but a phase so specialized as to take it out of any series to which other more general ideas may have assigned it. But as soon as we put into the Declaration of Rights the idea of union for the Rights of Englishmen, it immediately coalesces with a wide range of events — those from 1761 to 1775 — having the same content. The same is true of the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. If we think of the Declaration of Independence as expressing the idea of union against England, it and the other members of its series — most of the events between 1775 and 1783 — immediately join hands with the Declaration of Rights and its series of facts, the two series thus forming one. We may find in the Articles of Confederation the idea of domestic union, and if we do so it and the facts of our history immediately associated with it combine with the Constitution and its associated events so as to form a greater series. If we look upon the Constitution as marking the progress of the idea of union in general, it not only joins hands with the Articles of Confederation and the two great Declarations, but also with all the main facts of the American Revolution.

PERIOD OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALITY.

The Period as a Whole.

General Nature of the Period. — The student will find greater difficulty in discovering the dominant idea of this period than in the case of the Revolution. The movements in the preceding period were rapid; thought and passion centered around a few definite propositions and moved with such rapidity that extraneous matters were pushed aside. The struggle, in its externals, was dramatic and absorbing, as is usually the case with revolutions. Because of this very intensity, the period was a short one, if measured in the number of its years.

The movement of ideas in the new period is, for the most part, much slower, the exception being in its latter portion. Besides their more evolutionary growth, ideas and institutions are constantly becoming more complex, and therefore distracting elements more frequently obtrude themselves. Again, the period chronologically covers nearly three times as much ground as the Revolution. The student ought to be, as a result of previous experience with such problems, far better prepared to cope with the difficulties of the new period.

The Revolution had developed the form of a nation, and expressed the result in the Constitution. In the beginning, the forms set up by this instrument did not have a perfected national spirit to animate them. The struggle with England had produced a good degree of national sentiment on foreign questions, and the campaign for the sovereignty of the nation as a basis of union had done much toward making us a nation on purely domestic interests. The growth of national sentiment, with reference to foreign questions, had been more rapid and substantial than on domestic matters. The Declaration of Independence, relating primarily to foreign affairs, was more nationalistic in its tone and propositions than the Articles of Confederation which were concerned primarily with domestic questions; and the Articles themselves conferred more powers on congress in regard to foreign, than to home, relations. While the united strength of these two phases of sentiment did not really make the thirteen states a nation, yet the germs of one had begun to take root.

The long struggle in the constitutional convention and the longer and severer battle for ratification in the states, accompanied by anger, jealousy, suspicion, charges of bad motives, and threats of alliances, go to show that the preliminary victory for nationality was won with difficulty. It may aid us to judge the true strength of the new movement if we recall that the Constitution would probably have been defeated had the congress of the Confederation thrown its influence in the scale against it, had Washington re-

fused his support, or had it been sent to the people for ratification by direct vote. But even as it was, the feeling for stronger government was not general enough to get the Constitution through the great states of Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia, without a definite understanding that it was to be amended quite freely. Again we see that the spirit of nationality had not come into full being, but was beginning to germinate. This spirit requires that the people's thought break over the narrow limits of state lines and contemplate the broader and deeper questions that arise out of the life of the whole. This broadening of thought does not belong to political problems alone, but to all forms of institutional life. Questions of government, religion, education, and industry must lay hold of the minds and hearts of the whole people. The spirit of nationality does not require the people to be a unit on all the details of organization and the means of accomplishing specific ends, but it does require them to transfer a portion of their admiration and affection from the state and locality to the nation ; that they love the good of the whole more than the narrower interests of the locality, or rather, that they see the highest interests of the state and neighborhood in the highest good of the whole. Nationality is not only a sentiment which thrills the multitude on great occasions, but it is a principle of action for the statesman. It is that principle which declares that national functions shall be exercised for the good of the whole, and looks upon the nation as the most appropriate and efficient agent in the performance of such functions. The senti-

ment and principle are interactive; each is the cause and the effect of the other; they rise and fall together. For their perfect manifestation they require an organism of thought and feeling so sensitive and sympathetic that the response of all the parts is quick and perfect when any portion of the organism is affected.

It fell to our history between 1789 and 1870 to produce this result. It was in this time that the germs of national life, which originated mainly in the last phase of the Revolution, were so developed as to constitute a new era in our institutional evolution. So wide is its sweep and deep its current that the stream of nationality is the greatest, the most fundamental, movement that took place between these two dates. It is the presence of this overwhelming principle and sentiment that constitutes this a period in American history. There were other mighty agencies at work during this time; some were in harmony with nationality, and others were in deadly conflict with it; yet they were all either absorbed or destroyed by this dominant one.

The Phases of the Period. — If the above propositions are true, it follows that the growth of the spirit of nationality is the organizing idea for the period, and that its phases will furnish the organizing principle for the sub-periods. These are as follows:

Relations between Nationality and Democracy, 1789–1840.

1. A Period of Conflict, 1789–1803.
2. The Mutual Approach of Nationality and Democracy, 1800–1820.

3. Fusion of Nationality and Democracy Working out its Results, 1816–1840.

Relations between Nationality and Slavery, 1820–1870.

1. Slavery Gradually Grows Hostile to Nationality, 1820–1840.
2. Sectionalization of Interests and Sentiments, 1835–1860.
3. Death of Slavery and Triumph of Nationality, 1860–1870.

RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONALITY AND DEMOCRACY.

A Period of Conflict.

The Germs of the Conflict. — At the opening of this period only the professional classes, the well-to-do, and the well-educated, were imbued with the spirit of nationality; and even these were not all thoroughly devoted to this idea, and furnished many examples of opposition. The mass of the common people were certainly more given to local interests and more controlled by state pride than by national sentiment. Of course many of this class had been influenced by the preceding campaign, and were in a position to be converted to nationality. But most of them were inclined to look with suspicion upon, and therefore resent, any attempt to do through national instrumentalities what had heretofore been accomplished by local agencies. At the same time, it was a deep conviction of

the great leaders of the "well-born" classes that the country's only hope lay in extending its sphere of national activity.

Under the above conditions, a struggle between nationality and democracy.[1] was almost inevitable. This conscious conflict is one of the differentiating marks of the first phase of nationality. No doubt, as we shall see, many events took place which caused nationality to make, unconsciously, very steady gains. There are always these two forms of growth, the conscious and the unconscious, and in no other period was the prominent movement more promoted by events which produced non-purposed results and unintended effects.

Unconscious Progress of National Sentiment. — In the opening events of this period we witness no conflict between democracy and nationality, but nevertheless we must discover how events contributed to the general movement. The election of representatives, senators, and the electoral college formally opened the new era. As the student looks into these events, he will discover that in form and purpose they are new, and without difficulty will find their cause in the provisions of the new Constitution.[2] Probably the great variety in election methods will attract

[1] The term "democracy," when used to designate a political party, will be capitalized, but not when designating the mass of plain people, their ideas and sentiments.

[2] Just here the student must go to the Constitution and read its provisions concerning these processes. This is not only desirable as a means to a proper understanding of the events, but it is the best way to study so-called "Civil Government."

his attention. He should see that while electors were mostly chosen by state legislatures, in Virginia and Maryland they were elected by a direct popular vote, and in Massachusetts by a mixed method — two electors being chosen by the people, and the rest by the legislature from twenty-four names presented by congressional districts. In New York no electors were chosen because the upper house demanded a concurrent vote, while the lower house held out for a joint one. The houses also quarreled in New Hampshire over the method of election. The lack of uniformity was exhibited in congressional elections. In New Jersey one portion of the state kept open the polls for three weeks and only closed them on proclamation from the governor. Connecticut voted twice, first for three men, and afterwards to elect one of the three as a representative. In Massachusetts some of the districts voted twice before members could be elected. What is the historical significance of these conflicting and contrasting methods? This can be seen by comparing them with the uniformity which prevails to-day. The difference between then and now reveals the distance in idea between the two periods, and how much nationalization has had to do in order to work out methods of election common to all portions of the nation, and coöperative to national ends. These election processes, however different in different places, were for common national ends. The people of the whole country were made to engage in the same acts at the same time and for like purposes. The repetition of this series of events and of the incidents connected therewith greatly

promoted the consideration of matters of common concern, and to this extent broadened the ideas and sympathies of the people — drawing them away from the narrower and opposing interests of the community and the state. This, on the whole, has been the tendency and the result of all national elections.

Akin to this was the effect of Washington's journey from Mt. Vernon to New York to be inaugurated. It was a continuous triumph; in one place there were feasts and toasts, in another escorts and processions, and in a third a combination of these. Decorations of cedar and laurel, flags and liberty caps, triumphal arches and evergreen crowns, bonfires and signal lights, firing salutes and ringing bells, patriotic songs and appropriate mottoes signified the people's affection for the national hero. The inaugural ceremonies exhibited similar enthusiasm on the part of those present. The people who read and heard of these interesting events were also thrilled with hope and pride over the auspicious beginnings of the national government. This effect upon the feelings of the people was, perhaps, the most important contribution made by these events to the history of the country.

The Struggle Originates over Domestic Questions. — The stimulus given to national sentiment by the above events was largely, if not entirely, unconscious. The people did not plan to develop national affection, and hardly had their attention called to this result; but nevertheless, such was the result. The fact that the growth was unconscious proves nothing against the strength of the sentiment, for

unconscious growth is often the most natural, and hence the most substantial and permanent. We now come to consider a conscious movement. In this, some of the people formed definite purposes and called into being appropriate agencies for their realization, while others were just as definitely determined to oppose and circumvent these ends. The contest over the leading measures and events of Washington's and Adams' administrations may be denominated a contest between nationality and democracy. This is a correct statement of the nature of the first phase of development in the period of nationality. Two general considerations prove it : the nature of the ideas in conflict, and the contrasts between the people who gathered around these ideas. In the first case we find measures and means taken for the primary purpose of calling into vigorous life national agents and functions. This policy was defended under the principle of liberal construction of the Constitution. All this was strongly combated by the idea of local self-government — the basal idea of primitive democracy. As a feeling, the fear was that the position of the states and the interests of sections might become subordinated to those of the nation. The defence of this position was sought in the principle of strict construction of the Constitution, which was often interpretated to mean state sovereignty. In the second place, the people composing the opposition belonged to what is often called the democracy,—the people in the humbler walks of life who, by experience, are strongly attached to localities. The people supporting the measures of

national import included the majority of the well-to-do and the educated classes. From interest, education, and experience, this portion of the people was better fitted to take broad views of governmental questions than their opponents.

In this contest the presence of two classes of events will be observed,—those relating to domestic affairs and those concerning foreign relations. The work and measures of Hamilton may be properly regarded as precipitating the conflict of ideas alluded to above. These were a tariff and excise, the funding and assumption bills, and a United States bank and mint. An examination of the controversy over the tariff will reveal that its immediate purpose was to obtain revenue sufficient to meet the pressing needs of the government, and that another purpose was hardly secondary to this: to "give a just and decided preference to our labors." Over the first object but little dispute occurred, its aim being so clearly just and necessary; but the question of protection aroused animated discussion. The conduct of congress demonstrated the fact that a power had arisen capable, by its decisions, of doing great good to some national interests, and perhaps harm to others. The result was that as many interests as possible tied themselves thus early to the nation and became, perforce, the supporters of the administration and the nationalistic view of the functions of government. The opposition to the tariff was not so much against the principle as because of certain interests which would be affected unfavorably. Whatever may be thought about

the policy of discriminating between foreign and domestic goods, and whatever may have been the arguments pro and con used at this time or at any other time, two things must be clearly in mind in order to reach a correct appreciation of the historical meaning of the tariff. Certain industrial interests were linking themselves to the nation and were bidding for national favor, and both friend and foe to the tariff in these debates, in or out of congress, aided in forcing upon the attention of the people questions of general as well as of local concern, and thus contributed to awaken a national consciousness.

But the feeling over the tariff was tame as compared with the passion engendered by the funding and assumption bills. These measures were explained before congress early in 1790, and included plans for paying the foreign and domestic debts and also the state debts incurred during the War of the Revolution. The plans for the payment of the foreign debt met with little or no opposition. The foreign debt seemed one of honor and gratitude owed to friendly nations, but somehow the home debt was not quite in the same category. Many, in and out of congress, argued against paying the face value of the obligation to the present holders. Discussions on this point began to reveal two classes of persons,—moneyed men and speculators, and the original holders of the debt, many of whom were farmers and laborers and former soldiers. Their interests were supposed to clash, and some ground for this appeared in the fact that men of small means had been compelled to part with their certificates, and that even

then speculators were scouring the country in search of continental promises still held by the people of the back districts. But in the interest of the nation's credit, congress voted the measure without any distinction between the original and the present holder of the certificate. Just as the vote on the foreign debt raised America in the eyes of foreign countries, so the success of this measure demonstrated the absolute fidelity of the nation to its home creditors, and immediately gave our own citizens concrete proof of the strength of the new government.

The assumption of the state debts aroused the strongest opposition yet encountered. The public took an interest in the contest, the newspapers were often filled with communications on the subject, and even threats of disunion were made. Here was pressed the argument of strict construction as a means of opposition and of protection to the interests of localities. The debates went on with varying effects during the spring and summer of 1790, and the bill was finally passed by means of an agreement between Hamilton and Jefferson that eastern votes should give the national capital to the South, and southern votes should carry the assumption of the state debts. Out of this conflict came two enduring results: 1. The location and establishment of the capital whose life and environment testify to the aspiration of the people after a truly national existence, and where there is gathered the external evidence of a national organization. 2. The consciousness that the assumption bill was a purposed and extraordinary stretch of national authority. This result gave

satisfaction to some and alarm to others. Virginia's legislature voted that assumption was "dangerous to the rights of the people."

After assumption, the nation needed more revenue than the tariff supplied. Hamilton proposed an excise on distilled liquors. It met opposition, but not on the ground of being unconstitutional, for the strict constructionist could find the very word "excise" in the Constitution. Nevertheless, the people who were coming to accept this view of the Constitution were the opponents of the new measure. The ground of opposition was fundamentally the same as that against assumption,—the desire to prevent the extension of national authority. They saw in this new law a very great increase in the number of government officials who would go prying around the country and into the private business of many people. The bill passed in 1791, and in 1794 the opposition of people of western Pennsylvania, encouraged by sympathizers in other states, resisted the collection of the excise till the militia, summoned by national authority, suppressed the Whiskey Rebellion. While the national authority was thus vindicated by force of arms, the opposition began to consolidate itself more and more.

The last of Hamilton's great financial plans was a United States bank. More than the other measures did this call into exercise the implied powers of the Constitution, and bind the business interests more firmly to the government. In that time, before the unwritten Constitution was thought of, it certainly was an unusual exercise of power to call a

bank into existence to carry out the nation's right to raise revenue and pay the debts of the United States. The provisions of the law made the government a stockholder, and permitted it to borrow $100,000 from the bank. The bank was to have no national rival, and could greatly aid the government in making loans, and aid business by establishing branches in leading business centers. The opposition was intense. Even Madison began to use the principle of strict construction, and Jefferson exerted his influence to organize opposition and secure a veto of the bill.

As the effects of these measures began to work out, and the immediate and remote purposes of their friends and opponents became clearer, the people began to divide among themselves and gather around leaders. "While conservatives, aristocrats, the commercial class, the timorous, and the friends of powerful rule thus gravitated toward Hamilton, . . . the liberty-loving, those jealous of class supremacy and court manners, they who detested money-changers and the new methods of growing rich, together with the floating remnants of the Anti-Federal and State Rights party, were irresistibly attracted toward Jefferson." This growing separation into parties is further made apparent by the establishment of partisan papers. Thus Hamilton's policy created a great contest between nationality and democracy. This is the all-inclusive result, and will translate and explain more events than any other movement of that time.

The Progress of the Conflict over Foreign Relations. — The discussion which follows, like the one on domestic

questions, does not purport to be a complete history of these events, and deals with only so much of incident and detail as is necessary to show the progress of this interesting struggle and the evolution of its resultant, — a rising nation. Before the conflict between nationality and democracy had fully developed, a new element injected itself into the controversy, — the war between France and England. This war grew out of the progress of the French Revolution. The American people were sympathetic spectators from the very beginning of this revolution, because France seemed to be following the example which she had so generously aided in establishing in America. At the first appearance of French extravagance those Americans who followed Hamilton and strong government began to lose sympathy with the Revolution, and were ready when war came to sympathize with England. The more democratic among our people were only made stronger friends of France by the fact of war against England and the rising opposition at home. Our treaty relations with France, the arrival of a French minister, and the growing differences among Americans induced Washington and his cabinet to issue the famous Proclamation of Neutrality. This document in effect announced to the world our determination to stand aloof from European complications, and was consequently the herald of a rising confidence in the ability of the new nation to maintain its place without the support of any European ally. It thus planted the germ of a permanent foreign policy which ultimately made us really an independent people. The Declaration of Inde-

pendence was the expression of an intense desire for political separation from England. The war made this an objective fact. But both could not destroy America's dependence upon Europe; the colonial habit could not be thus easily eradicated. Looking backward, the proclamation was a new declaration of independence, while looking forward, it was a new prophecy of nationality. The immediate result, however, was to disappoint France and her friends and to please her enemies. The passing public sentiment was with France and against England, and the people joined with enthusiasm in the demonstrations connected with the reception of Genet, the French minister. The latter cultivated successfully the feeling against England and tried to turn the public against the proclamation and its enforcement, and finally against Washington's administration. He failed, lost public esteem, and was superseded. A great deal of significance must attach to the fact that while the majority of the people took sides with France against England in a way to suggest little national self-respect, yet when called upon by the conduct of Genet to choose between Genet and France on the one hand, and Washington and America on the other, the decision was prompt and patriotic for that day.[1] The full significance of this reaction, as it expressed itself in the great cities in public demonstrations to uphold Washington

[1] Historians have often set forth these facts as proof of our dependence upon European standards as they are, but more often have they failed to give full significance to this reaction. The one interpretation discovers the past and the other the future in these events.

and neutrality, can be more fully appreciated when we remember that support of France and opposition to England were now an article in the creed of the opposition party.

The more radical members of the democratic societies were never enthusiastic over neutrality. These organizations sprang into existence with the coming of Genet, in imitation of the French Jacobin clubs. They affected to believe themselves the true disciples of the Rights of Man, and that the hope of Europe hung on the success of the French Revolution. No doubt this affiliation with France retarded the success of neutrality, yet it must be remembered that these societies also aimed to make America more democratic. Their fundamental cause lies in the growing conflict between nationality and democracy. They would have had no existence if there had not been a body of men of opposite ideas and purposes, and who were looked upon as favoring less democracy, if not more aristocracy, in the government of America. These societies became the severest critics of the administration and encouraged the Whiskey Rebellion. They possessed the virtues and defects of mad enthusiasts over ideas necessary for the complete development of American nationality, and were also the angry opponents of an idea whose union with democracy was necessary to the latter's permanent and healthy existence on this continent.

The contribution to nationality made by our relations with France was greatly influenced by our relations with England. Troubles with England had come down through the Confederation. She refused to carry out some of the pro-

visions of the treaty of 1783, and to give up her illiberal commercial policy. In addition, the war in Europe made it desirable for her to confiscate American commerce of any kind with France and French colonies, and also to search American vessels for English-born sailors. This injury to property and persons sailing under the American flag aroused great indignation against England in 1793 and 1794. Measures of retaliation were proposed in congress, and a temporary embargo was passed. President Washington sent Chief Justice Jay to England to arrange matters. This mission made the democracy in the country furious, as they could discover in it all sorts of danger to America, insults to France, and truckling to England. Unfortunately the treaty itself could easily be taken as proof of all this. The senate confirmed the treaty after a hard fight, but popular feeling was so strong against Hamilton that he was in danger from mobs; Jay was burned in effigy, and Washington himself was vilified. The treaty perhaps saved us from war at that time. But while it promoted partisanship, it taught the friends of England that she was not likely to be at all generous while dealing with American interests. England missed a great opportunity to restore to some extent the sympathy lost in the Revolution; but she began to teach Americans the lesson they needed most to learn: that nothing but self-interest would control European nations in dealing with America. Of course this lesson was not fully mastered till we had another experience with France, and a decisive one with England during the War of 1812.

The second experience with France was in the administration of John Adams. The French had indulged in the pastime of capturing American vessels, and now looked upon Jay's treaty as an insult. They also resented the recall of Minister Monroe — a Democrat — and refused to receive C. C. Pinckney instead, or any other minister, till their alleged injuries had been atoned. In 1797 Gerry and Marshall were sent to join Pinckney. The Directory kept them waiting while its agents X, Y, and Z tried to secure a bribe of £50,000 as the condition of French favor. The ringing message of President Adams and the publication of the X, Y, Z correspondence kindled a flame of indignation. Democratic friendship for France was almost silenced; democracy was beginning to learn its lesson. Measures for war were rapidly pushed forward in the spring and summer of 1798; they included a land force with Washington as commander-in-chief, and a further equipment of the navy. The war spirit ran high, and addresses of congratulation and expressions of enthusiastic support poured in on President Adams. Great demonstrations were held to testify the people's resentment against France and their approval of the president's spirited conduct. The black cockade superseded the French tricolor in popular favor, and the elections of 1798 indicated a rising Federal tide. Subscriptions to extreme democratic papers fell off, particularly in the case of the *Aurora*, which had advocated compliance with the corrupt demands of the Directory. This whole experience taught Jefferson and his Democratic-Republicans that

little good and great harm were likely to result to their party from partisanship for France. While the term "French party" was still applied to them, yet from this time on it had little justification.

Rapid Development of Anti-Democratic Sentiment among the Federalists. — The Federalists now became over-confident as they saw themselves floating into power again on a wave of popularity. They thought the reaction an approval of their principles, while it was rather an expression of national feeling against France. When, therefore, they tried to transform this into a condemnation of the democratic spirit of their opponents, they wrought their own destruction. Three measures were passed by congress in 1798 to accomplish this end: 1. An amendment to the naturalization law, extending the term of preliminary residence from five to fourteen years. The Federalists feared the presence of foreigners, but this fear would have been very slight if these foreigners had been enrolling themselves under the banner of strong government. 2. An act concerning aliens which gave the president power to order them to depart from our country if he considered them dangerous to its welfare. Disobedience to his decree was punishable by imprisonment, and forfeiture of citizenship forever. 3. An act to punish citizens by fine and imprisonment for opposing the national administration by combination or by scandalous or malicious writing. This act demonstrated thorough distrust of freedom of discussion and of the tendencies of American democracy. These acts, and the attempts to enforce the last one, mark the extreme

application of national authority by the adherents of strong government to protect it against the opposition. The reaction expressed in the election of Jefferson in 1800 showed that the people were no more ready to follow the attempt to suppress democracy than they were to support the friends of France in 1798. The instincts and judgment of the people were entirely correct in refusing to follow either, for the perpetuity of the nation demanded that nationality should become democratic, as well as that democracy should become nationalistic.

The immediate result of this legislation was the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, prepared by Jefferson and Madison, and passed by their legislatures. They protested against the Alien and Sedition laws, set forth the nature of the national government, and deduced therefrom the grounds of opposition. There were three main points to each: 1. The Constitution is a compact between sovereign states, and the national government is one of limited and specified powers. 2. The sovereign states are the judges of violations of the compact. 3. In cases of palpable and dangerous violations it is the duty of the states to "interpose," said Virginia, and "nullify," said Kentucky. These resolutions were the most extreme assertion as yet made of the principle of state sovereignty as a means of protecting democracy in its struggle for existence. While they called the attention of the country, in an official way, to the dangers of the new legislation, the people did not rally enthusiastically to their support. In fact, not another legislature voted them as the sentiment of its

state, while several condemned them. It was thus tolerably evident that one extreme was offsetting the other.

In spite of the reaction against the Alien and Sedition laws, the Federalists were in favor, in 1799 and 1800, of keeping up a good military and naval force and of extending the scope of the national judiciary. The latter was accomplished by a national bankrupt act which gave district courts plenty of work, and by a bill which established circuit courts, circuit judges, and provided facilities for appeals from state to national courts. These measures showed a determination to strengthen national authority as far as possible against the rising tide of democracy. In fact this last measure was passed after Jefferson's election, and the appointments under it were incomplete when Jefferson took his seat. The extension of the national judiciary and the appointment of John Marshall as Chief Justice exerted a powerful influence in preventing real injury to the national system by the success of Jefferson's anti-national followers; and while the repeal of many measures could not be hindered, yet Marshall and his decisions did make impossible any application of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions.

The Triumph of Democracy. — The political battle in 1800 was another phase of the contest between nationality and democracy. It was the first organized and successful effort of the latter to get hold of the machinery by means of which their opponents had wielded power. The conscious effort to get control had grown steadily since Jefferson left Washington's cabinet, and, with the exception of the

reaction in 1798, the people were slowly moving toward Jefferson and democracy. The campaign of 1800 was contested with great passion, and each party professed to see, in the success of the other, great danger to the country. The causes of the defeat of the Federal party were: 1. The aristocratic tendencies of its leaders which led some of the common people who followed them for a time finally to desert for more congenial associations. Not only did these leaders believe in and advocate government by means of position and influence, but they scarcely tried to conceal their distrust of the common people. 2. An excessive dependence upon national power, and the knowledge that many Federal leaders advocated its further extension, even to invading what was then supposed to belong to the reserved rights of the states. This policy, as it appeared in efforts at legislation, was the logical result of the preceding cause. 3. The presence of irreconcilable factions in the party — one clustering around Hamilton, the other supporting President Adams. This fact of itself was proof of the degeneracy of the party that had done a noble work in establishing national power. In the long, hard battle its habits had become so set that democratic measures of a moderate sort found little support in its ranks. This failure to appreciate and acquiesce in the popular decision was shown in the intrigues over the choice of a president by the representatives. No one doubted that Jefferson was meant for the first place by his party, but still the result was long delayed, and if moderate counsel had not prevailed among the Federalists, it is hard to say what the

result would have been. This last episode rendered them more unpopular with the masses.

The defeat of the Federalists was not the death of nationality. The success of the Republicans was not the triumph of the extreme principles of their party. Whatever pledges they had made must now be modified by the fact that they are to work through national machinery. The operation of this machinery could not be obstructed, for this would discredit the party. Besides, what harm could come to democracy while its leaders were in control? Jefferson's inaugural was such as to allay fears of reactionary measures, and to indicate a purpose to win over the moderates of the opposition. This was not for purposes hostile to the nation, for Jefferson wrote that he wished "to restore that harmony which our predecessors so wickedly made it their object to break, to render us again one people, acting as one nation." His moderation is further revealed in his inaugural by the statement in regard to the proper position of the state and national governments: "The support of the state governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad." The above quotations are the keynote to his moderation in making removals from office, and the middle course the party took in carrying out its policy.

Three reforms were immediately undertaken: 1. Repeal

of the law extending the Federal courts, and the impeachment of obnoxious judges. The former was accomplished, but the latter was only partially successful. It was found impossible to secure the conviction of so bitter a partisan as Judge Chase. The failure to intimidate the judiciary left the national system impregnable, and taught the extreme Republicans their limitations. 2. The repeal of internal taxes. This included Hamilton's excise and a sort of stamp duty passed, under danger of war, in Adams' administration. We have already seen how the people resented this form of taxation and objected to the burden imposed. This necessitated great retrenchment in national expenditures. The civil service, the army, and the navy were largely cut down. The democratic idea of government, as well as economy, called for some reform. 3. The naturalization law was restored to its former condition, thus proving democracy the friend of the foreigner who sought a home in America. A fourth proof of democratic spirit was given by Jefferson himself when he abolished the forms and ceremonies that had grown up between the legislative and executive departments, and simplified or abolished social affairs connected with his office. Jefferson thoroughly opposed courtly ceremonial and official parade as entirely inconsistent with republicanism. He determined to set the example himself of one who ruled a great people by the merit of his work, and not by the external trappings so characteristic of the governments of Europe.

The popularity of these measures and of Jefferson's

general conduct was rapidly demonstrated by the constant accessions to his party. His whole policy made it evident that his opponents had intentionally misrepresented him and his party, or had misunderstood the intention and spirit of democracy.

Mutual Approach of Nationality and Democracy.

General Features of this Phase. — Long ago the student must have discovered that at the very point of triumph in the movement of an idea, a new phase of it begins to take form. Gradually democracy and nationality cease to battle against each other, and more and more find the highest good of one to be the greatest good of the other. The changed circumstances and relations wrought by the preceding struggle made its continuance well-nigh impossible. First, we have seen that democracy has not always been hostile to a reasonable national patriotism, although their opponents so argued. Secondly, the Federalists were now an opposition party, and it would be very awkward for them to oppose the new administration by urging it to a more vigorous exercise of national power. In fact, they soon became anti-national themselves, and advocated strict construction of the Constitution. They thus abandoned their old ground to their opponents. Thirdly, the development of great national parties forced upon the attention of the people a constant study of questions of national import. Unless the democracy of the country

could develop common sympathies over common objects, it could not maintain itself. Local interests and objects might do as the basis for an opposition; but after victory, what then? Very evidently the party must enter on a well-defined policy, and bring into harmonious coöperation all its elements of support. Mere party success, therefore, tended to call into being an organization with national features. In the fourth place, the very complete success of Jefferson's party in both state and nation, by the close of his first administration, placed a vast responsibility on its shoulders. How could this best be met? Not by refusing to use power, but by its vigorous exercise.

The democratic leaders did not consciously aim to centralize power, but the circumstances named above were against them, and the future opened up opportunities and duties that could be met in no other way. In spite of these controlling circumstances, the leaders still continued to make their political confessions in terms of strict construction. The explanation is partly found in the fact that the circumstances of the new situation were not correctly divined, and that the growth of interest among the masses in national questions and their readier response to the sentiment of nationality were largely unconscious. This is particularly true of the movement up to the War of 1812. From this date till 1820 the people are more and more conscious that the old Jeffersonian democracy is moving in new directions. In the analysis and interpretation of this new phase of the relation between

nationality and democracy, the narration of events will be omitted as far as possible, since the only purpose is to reveal to the student the process by which these two forces began to approach each other.

The Purchase of Louisiana (1803).—This was the greatest event of Jefferson's administration, and, because of its effect upon nationality, may properly be taken as opening the new movement. After the leading incidents of the purchase are in hand, attention must be turned to the bearing of the event on the problem before us. 1. The fact of the purchase is of itself positive evidence of the vast development in national sentiment already accomplished. No such an acquisition of foreign territory was possible under the Confederation, and this may be taken as a measure of the distance national sentiment has traveled since 1789. 2. The purchase produced a profound effect upon the settlers of the Southwest by checking their growing hostility to the national government. The Federalists had neglected them, and more than once had they talked of setting up for themselves. Now their interests were secure from foreigners at the mouth of the Mississippi, and their commerce moved unchecked to the Gulf and the Atlantic states. Commercial connection was no small factor in binding these people to the rest of the Union. The strength of this growth and its value to the Union were put to the test when Burr formed his conspiracy. Had his expedition been made earlier while this hardy people was disaffected it might have been successful, but coming after the purchase it was easily a

failure. 3. The possession of land beyond the Mississippi gave added weight to arguments for a system of internal improvement, and no doubt influenced the construction of the great National Road, whose eventual western terminus was near St. Louis. The whole project of internal improvement, both proposed and accomplished, did much toward knitting the parts of the nation together. The possession of the Mississippi with its tributaries gave an unlimited opportunity to Fulton's invention which was soon plying the great river and its connections, and thus by rapid communication aided in consolidating the parts of the Union. All sections now seemed to dwell in closer proximity than ever before. 4. Almost a million square miles, added to our national domain, seemed to offer unlimited opportunity for the expansion of population and the creation of new states. This, with the states from the old Northwest, which were to bear the same relation to the Union, profoundly affected national sentiment, and even changed the nature of the Union. These new states are the creatures of the nation, while the old thirteen were its creators. They could not look back with pride to a period of independent existence. On the whole, therefore, their people had different feelings toward the nation from those of the people of the older states, and in the main this difference was on the side of love and admiration for the rising nation. 5. The preservation of the balance of power between sections had been an object of solicitude since the constitutional convention. The purchase was bitterly opposed in New England as destroying its position in the Union, and

caused threats of secession. For the time, national spirit declined in this section, but remotely the purchase gave a great preponderance to the free over the slave states, and thus contributed powerfully to save the Union in the Civil War. 6. Immediately the purchase argued for nationality by demonstrating the impracticability of strict construction. Strict construction was a fundamental principle in the creed of Jefferson's party, but he and his party consciously violated it because it stood in the way of a great national interest. Not only this, but it was all done without even asking the consent of the states whose future relations to the Union were so fundamentally touched. This act did not even emanate from the legislative department, but was almost entirely the work of the national executive.[1] If this act be tried by the standard of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions it is quite revolutionary, and Jefferson himself must have felt so, for he suggested amending the Constitution so as to ratify his action. His party did not take his suggestion seriously, thus showing its lack of interest in making good one of its old dogmas and its willingness to be responsible for

[1] In the interpretation of the purchase the student may discover and state its meaning in various terms, but may not at first effort be able to reduce them to terms of nationality. But, if possible, the answers should all be so reduced in order that their highest significance may be realized, and that they may be unified under some great principle of growth. If possible, the student must see that the greatest results of this event were largely unconscious, or so remote that their actors did not perceive them.

an act that did vastly more to consolidate national power than any act of either Hamilton or Adams.[1]

English Aggressions, 1803–1812. — This heading suggests the narration of events. But it is selected to name the external causes of an internal growth on the part of Americans. Already it has been mentioned that the tendency in this phase of development is for democracy and nationality to approach each other. The former is beginning to appreciate the necessity of the latter, while the latter is ceasing to fear the former. This process of mutual approach goes on more rapidly than ever before, for the need of each for the other is more continuous and pressing. The above growth is checked and limited by the rise of a counter movement mainly confined to New England and the middle states. This anti-national sentiment connected itself with sympathy for England, and thus brought upon itself the odium of being unpatriotic.

During the Confederation constant complaint was made against England's attitude toward her former colonies. This was continued down to Jay's treaty, and hardly ceased then. The occasion of its renewal grew out of cir-

[1] "However its statesmen might declaim about original compact, whatever Republican conventions might declare, the great empire beyond the Mississippi was to stand forever as a contradiction of their theories. Thereafter no man could, in the country store, around the post-office stove, on the courthouse steps, at the country fair, or upon the road, advance the 'compact' theory of the government, without being liable to have the Louisiana purchase thrown in his face." —Walker's *Making of the Nation*, p. 184.

cumstances connected with the Napoleonic wars. There were three main causes: 1. Seizure of neutral goods in American vessels. 2. Searching American vessels for former British seamen who had deserted or who had become naturalized Americans. 3. Impressment of American seamen. A fourth set of circumstances greatly aggravated the above, namely, the blockading and other decrees of both Napoleon and England.

The Democracy's Efforts at Redress.—Democracy is now in a process of transition, and tries to solve the most intricate problems of international relations by means consistent, to some extent, with its past profession of principles; but the new circumstances with their almost unsolvable problems at the same time forced a modification of these principles. Democracy cannot escape the laws of continuity and differentiation; hence what was done must partake of a double nature and seem inconsistent with its past, while in fact it was the highest kind of consistency. Jefferson and his party, in carrying out their programme, had curtailed both army and navy, and had reduced taxation to a strictly peace basis. But the above aggressions betokened war, and the problem was to coerce England especially, and at the same time avoid war. The following measures are referred to as briefly as possible for the purpose of discovering their double significance: how they connected themselves with the general spirit of democracy, and how they tended to transform and nationalize its spirit.

1. A naval militia, or local gunboats, was the first measure to secure protection to American commercial interests.

The plan was to furnish each seaport with the means of self-defence, to be employed as occasion offered. In the absence of danger the gunboat was to be out of water, and the crew about their usual occupations. This appeared to be a promising mode of avoiding heavy naval expenditures. But even this took over a million and a half of Jefferson's surplus and really accomplished little by way of defence; certainly it lowered us greatly in the estimation of the great armed nations of Europe.

2. The next were negotiations with England looking to a settlement of difficulties. These ran over much of Jefferson's last administration. England refused to surrender impressments, to admit that "free ships made free goods," and to open her West Indian ports to us. A treaty, completed in December, 1806, Jefferson did not submit to the senate, knowing full well that public sentiment would be deeply humiliated, and indignantly resent the insult. Nevertheless, Jefferson's method of disposing of the treaty was hardly in harmony with the spirit of democracy, although this same democracy justified the act, for the people forgot the method in their admiration of the act which refused to barter American seamen for a few paltry European trade concessions which England would not obey longer than European complications made it desirable.

3. In the same year, 1806, congress passed a Non-importation Act, another democratic measure of coercion. England was injured somewhat, but America was not benefited; the struggle with Napoleon was too intense for her to notice the harm we inflicted.

4. After the failure of these measures, and following the orders in council and the outrage on the Chesapeake, the president summoned congress in extra session and recommended the Embargo. Three days' debate in the house and four hours' in the senate sufficed to satisfy the majority. Indeed the nation's pride was deeply stung, and no doubt it felt the words uttered by John Quincy Adams: "The president has recommended the measure on his high responsibility. I would not consider, I would not deliberate, I would act." Seldom has such power been conferred on such short notice, and practically for the asking. No doubt the passage of this law proves the confidence of congress in the president, but it also proves his willingness to exercise vast national powers over commerce, such as none of his predecessors enjoyed. His judgment was to decide whether American ships were to go abroad, and his decision was to be backed by the navy and revenue cutters. From the very first the majority of Federalists in the middle states and New England were indignantly hostile to the measure, and soon the traders in the great ports were actively engaged in eluding the law. Smuggling found a supporting public sentiment in these places — especially in Boston and New York. The carrying trade and its allied interests looked upon the Embargo as purposely planned for their injury. Jefferson had created the impression that he was hostile to foreign commerce, and so he found his record on the question standing in the way of the law. The result was that New England Federalists became more and more anti-national, and were guilty, under the

exasperation of injury, of speaking words of sympathy for England. A few even recommended submission to British indignity as had been done by the French faction, and held private communications with the minister sent to adjust the Chesapeake affair. The legislatures of Federal states protested strongly against the Embargo; town meetings did likewise, and there were hints at separation. The spirit of opposition grew bolder after the act was amended in 1809 so as to extend the power of the president; the law was printed in mourning type, revolutionary mottoes were displayed, and hints were thrown out of a New England convention to inquire into the reserved rights of the states. However, matters in New England were not all running toward sectionalism, for a number of aggressive Republicans fought for the national policy, and found their ranks strengthened by the patriotic conduct of John Quincy Adams and other men of note. The disunion scare, the immense injury to all American interests, and the failure to produce any effect on either England or France led to the repeal of the Embargo in the spring of 1809.

Effects on the Progress of Democracy and Nationality. — Great results had been wrought out in this contest: 1. The Republican party, which was more and more in its composition becoming identical with American democracy had fairly committed itself to the exercise of vast national power, and had certainly pointed the way in emergencies to an almost despotic use of such power. Democracy was therefore beginning to occupy, with a courage born of experience, good old Federal ground, once held only by

Hamilton and his followers. The party of Jefferson was beginning to act as if necessity was the true interpreter of the Constitution. 2. The failure of the Embargo and of other peaceable means of coercion forced upon the country the conviction that war was a necessity. The continued conduct of England was producing gradually a war party within the ranks of the democracy. 3. The remnant of the Federal party had become pretty thoroughly sectional, and was beginning to make its political confessions in terms of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions. 4. A fourth phase of public sentiment appeared in the vehement accusations of these two parties, each against the other, of friendship for France and enmity toward England, or *vice versa*. This resulted in each party trying to avoid this cause of distrust for the future, so that when Non-intercourse was substituted for the Embargo, France and England were formally placed on the same footing. 5. Another fact containing the germ of a greater nationality grew out of the Embargo, namely, the rise of new industries and the expansion of those already established.

The War of 1812 as a Product of the National Spirit.— It has often been said, but will bear repeating, that the true interpretation of a series of events lies in two phases of public sentiment. First, the phase that immediately precedes, and is more or less in, the events themselves, and secondly, the phase that succeeds the events. The first is the true cause of the origin of the events, and to some extent determines their character. The second is their true result. So far as the series of events called the War

of 1812 is concerned, the process of interpretation has been begun in the preceding study. The main features of this first stage of public sentiment may be referred to again in order to trace them as factors in the production of the war: 1. An extreme anti-national sentiment opposed to war and to the exercise of national power by the party in office. This sentiment existed among the high Federalists. 2. A peace and strict-construction sentiment existing among the old Republicans, and on occasions coalescing with the Federalists. 3. A rising national and war sentiment which found its principal supporters in the so-called Republican party, and in a small contingent of patriotic Federalists whose party had deserted them. The war element was strong from Pennsylvania southward, and had the solid and enthusiastic support of the new states. In the absence of distracting local problems, the people of these rising western states and territories were more uniformly democratic and national than the populations of the old states; more democratic because the rough life of the frontier equalized conditions to a marvelous extent; more national because they were the creatures of the nation and felt their great dependence upon it. "Here no pride of statehood diminished the affection and devotion of the citizen to the government under which he held the title to his land; to which he looked for protection from the savage foe; which opened up the navigation of the rivers to his clumsy flatboat; which endowed the school in which his children learned to read. Constitutional scruples were at a discount with these rude, strong, brave men. . . . They

wanted a government, and a strong government; and in the continually growing power of the Republic they found the competent object of their civic trust and pride and love."[1] Originally followers of Jefferson, their peculiar life led them into the ranks of the aggressive portion of the party, while their harassing experiences with the Indians, due, as they thought, to British agents, made them early and enthusiastic advocates of war. The above is also applicable to the mountain populations of the older states. This sentiment soon found advocates in the national councils. Its chief exponents were Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, who were ably seconded by Felix Grundy, Langdon Cheves, and Porter. These men, aided by England's continued bad conduct, forced the peace-loving and timid Madison into war.

In making this interpretation it must not be forgotten that this war party, in spite of its great strides toward nationality, had inherited the legitimate fruits of that earlier democracy which doted on low taxes, a small navy, and a smaller army. The preservation of this condition had been a great argument for Jefferson's foreign policy. It was now more than an argument for democracy — it was a disaster to the country. Even now, on the verge of war with the greatest naval power of the world, the democracy of the nation could not quite recharter Hamilton's bank, and establish an efficient navy. It showed wonderful progress that the bank was defeated by but one vote, and that something was done towards a navy, but the

[1] Walker's *Making of the Nation*, p. 171.

"miss was as good as a mile." Of course nothing was more national in that day than the United States bank and the navy. The former touched the currents of trade everywhere, and its notes, bearing the national stamp, were no respecters of state lines. But even more was the navy the representative of national power. It stood as the visible symbol of national dignity to all foreign powers, and ready to assail them in defence of its people. The navy was not sectional. No state could claim it as it claimed the militia. A shot at the flag as it waved from the mast was felt by the whole people as an insult to be resented. A disinterested patriotism ought to have dictated a great navy, especially since the commercial states called for it. The failure to create one gave point to their opposition to the war. Aside from these failures, the war democracy was enthusiastic in the use of national powers, as the following measures enacted between 1811 and 1815 prove: an embargo preliminary to war, a doubling of the tariff, an excise and a stamp tax, provision for a great national debt, larger regular army, an army of volunteers, regulations pertaining to the use of the state militia, and finally, the administration was screwing up its courage for a conscription law and for government paper money. Most of these measures had been passionately denounced by the party in the campaign of 1800. The people were not inconsistent; they had grown.

The bearing of national sentiment on the progress of the war may be seen in the fact that where enthusiastic devotion to the nation was most universal, there the

greatest victories were won, and where this was at its lowest ebb, there occurred the greatest disasters. No anti-national sentiment could reach our navy on lake or sea, and the navy was the glory of the war. The victories of Harrison and Jackson were the most brilliant won on land, while the invasions of Canada, supported mainly by New York and New England, were the least successful campaigns of the war. The campaign for the defence of Washington may be regarded as a partial exception to the above.

Opposition to the declaration of war was strongest in New England and New York, but a few votes also came from other middle states and from the South. The progress of the conflict only intensified the hostility of New England. This section repeated in extremer fashion the methods of opposition used against the Embargo. Some additional means were: the refusal of one or two governors to allow the state militia to be used by the nation, attempts of capitalists to prevent loans to the nation, draining specie from southern and western banks, open expressions of favor for England, and finally, the Hartford Convention. These are all anti-national, particularly the last. It was popularly believed that its aim was the secession of New England from the Union. Its documents are thoroughly imbued with the state-sovereignty idea of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, as is amply demonstrated by the propositions set before their legislatures, and those recommended as amendments to the national Constitution.

The War as a Factor in Nationalizing Democracy. — The second phase of interpretation is to discover how this war promoted the evolution of the national spirit. To do this accurately the student must remember that the movement in ideas and institutions set on foot by it are more important than its military events. And yet it must not be forgotten that war is a sort of seething caldron of human thought and mad passion. Into this are poured old ideas and apparently permanent habits of action. These dissolve into their original elements, and new combinations are formed from them. War is a time of bold initiative and courageous endeavor; new men and new measures result from new environment. Hence we must expect the forces of nationality and democracy to come out of the war greatly modified. This is best discovered by looking into the content of the great measures that followed peace.

1. The national debt was over $120,000,000, while currency and credit were in a deplorable condition. Gallatin, Jefferson's great financier, tried to forestall disaster by asking for a new bank charter in 1811. This was refused. War with its lessons came, and President Madison, Secretary Dallas, Speaker Clay, and John C. Calhoun favored its restoration in 1816. Its capital was more than three times that of Hamilton's bank, and it was as fully endowed with authority. While it was more national, it was more democratic; five of its directors were appointed by the president, and both congress and the secretary of the treasury were more directly connected with this than

with the former. Stock was opened in each state, and congress could compel the location of branches among its constituents. In 1811 Henry Clay opposed the bank in an elaborate argument based on strict construction and true to the ancient ideals of his party; in 1816 he was just as enthusiastic for the bank, and his argument would have done credit to Hamilton. Clay was not inconsistent, but he had grown in knowledge and practical experience.

2. The Embargo and war cut off foreign importations, and at the same time greatly injured American capital employed in the carrying trade. This unintentional and injurious result gave origin to a phase of economic life which profoundly influenced the course of nationality. The need of a new field for capital and the demand for home products were simultaneous. By 1815 America had made great strides toward economic independence. Peace threatened to overwhelm the new industries by English competition. The nation was appealed to for defensive measures, and the party which had created conditions calling them into existence responded promptly and patriotically with a protective tariff. Madison himself argued for protection to industries tending to make us independent of foreign production. The champions of this tariff were the leaders of the war party; its opponents were Federalists and a few Republicans who still held to old party standards. But the majority of this party were now consciously using national power for the development of national resources.

3. Another lesson learned during the war was that good roads and other means of easy transit had something to

do with the success of military movements. Again war brought peace with the Indians, and population rapidly moved westward. Ohio in 1810 numbered only 230,000, but in 1820, 580,100. In 1810 Indiana had but 24,800, while in 1820 the population had risen to 147,000. Thus were social and economic reasons added to military necessity in favor of internal improvements. It had been the dream of Jefferson to apply the surplus which his economy had created to the unification of America by canals and roads, constructed by the coöperation of the state and national governments. John C. Calhoun in 1816 and 1817 presented a bill to create a national fund for internal improvement. Madison vetoed it because of its violation of the principle of strict construction, and recommended an amendment covering the question. The agitation for internal improvements went steadily on as new states rapidly rose in the West. Appropriations had already been made for the Cumberland Road. After the war the demand came for its extension to the westward under the name of the National Road. By 1820 over $1,500,000 had been expended upon it. So far had sentiment grown away from the old point of view that the national Republicans made internal improvements a cardinal point in their programme, and more than two and a quarter millions were appropriated for this purpose during John Quincy Adams' administration.

The final decline of sentiment in favor of national aid to roads and canals was not due to a decline in nationality, but because the steamboat and the railroad were beginning

to meet the demand for rapid and easy social and commercial communication. Fulton's invention was successful in 1807, and at the opening of the War of 1812 steamboats were appearing on western rivers. After the war their numbers grew rapidly; their work in binding the East to the West was of untold value to the nation, although it was largely a process whose significance was not then seen.

4. The war destroyed both the organization of the Federalists and the original doctrines of the Republicans. All that was vital in the former was developed and applied by the new Republicans. All that was dangerous in the Jeffersonian democracy was absorbed by the Federalists as an opposition party. As the contest went on democracy constantly gained and aristocracy as constantly lost. Federalism not only became narrow, but also unpatriotic and threatened the nation's life. It found no place among the hardy western populations, and because aristocracy does not emigrate it remained geographically stationary. Federalism disappeared in name in the Era of Good Feeling. Its old leaders had passed away; its younger members found congenial company among the National Republicans. On its political side the Era of Good Feeling marked the final disappearance of the difference that had separated democracy and nationality. And while the party calling itself Democratic does go on mumbling the Jeffersonian formulae, yet the body of its members do not oppose, but generally favor, nationality.

5. During the greater part of the era marked by the transformation of American democracy, a series of deci-

sions of vast consequence to the development of the nation were handed down by the Supreme Court. John Marshall had been made Chief Justice by John Adams just as the Federalist party was passing from power. Although deserted by his party, Marshall was faithful to the work appointed for him to do. Steadily there fell from his pen a series of decisions touching the powers of the nation under the Constitution. In 1816 the Supreme Court demonstrated its right to be the final interpreter of the Constitution thus limiting the power of state courts. Later Marshall rendered a decision justifying a resort to implied powers in the creation of the bank; in 1810, and again in 1819, he denied the power of the state legislature to impair the obligations of contracts. Public sentiment was not shocked at the principles announced in these decisions, thus showing how much it had grown, especially between 1810 and 1820.

6. The war exerted many subtle effects on the mutual movements of nationality and democracy. None were more so than the effect upon what may be termed American literary thought. No department of life yielded so slowly to the inspiring touch of nationality and democracy. Before the war little was produced which could be called literature, and less that was national in tone, although there was much controversial writing over politics. The literary men were generally out of sympathy with the democratic movements of the period, and seldom found subjects relating to American life and tendencies to inspire their pens. The few writers were generally imitators of Euro-

pean standards. The nationalizing effect of the war showed itself in the field of literature, for now there arose men who soon won fame for America. Among them may be named Paulding, Irving, Bryant, Cooper, Halleck, Drake, Percival, and Sprague. In 1815 was founded the *North American Review.* As early as 1811 was established that famous old journal, *Niles' Weekly Register*, whose intense Americanism did much to stimulate national pride. A new race of orators, deeply imbued with an ardor truly patriotic, now sprang into existence. Among these were Channing, Clay, Webster, Everett, and many others of lesser note.

Significance of the Era of Good Feeling. — This is partly discovered in the facts immediately preceding. Its deeper meaning lies in the fact that it was the culmination of the movement for the nationalization of American democracy and for the popularizing of American nationality. Then was political disintegration complete and political animosity forgotten. President Monroe's journey, as far eastward as Boston and westward as Detroit, furnishes sufficient evidence that there was once more a president of the whole people.[1] It was also an age of political integration, for in

[1] It was a Boston paper that called this period "the era of good feeling." Another Boston paper said that "the visit of the president seems to have wholly allayed the storms of party. People now meet in the same room who a short while since would scarcely pass along the same street." A third stated that "the visit has a more direct tendency than any other to remove prejudices, to harmonize feelings, annihilate dissensions, and make us indeed one people." In Hartford the president was called a "political father and guide." — McMaster, vol. iv. pp. 379–380.

the crisis of the election in 1824 men of Federal antecedents and the National Republicans coalesced and elected John Quincy Adams. This presaged a new party. In this campaign each section had its candidate, and so strongly were the people attached to their favorite sons that they refused to abide by the customary action of the congressional caucus. This institution had stood between the presidency and the people, but it was now forever destroyed. The destruction of this undemocratic piece of machinery shows a tendency of the people to directly participate in national affairs ; they were greatly stimulated by the presence of presidential candidates from so many parts of the country. The common people took a sort of personal interest, not before witnessed, in the campaign because of their warm personal regard for the candidates. This was also prophetic.

The Fusion of Nationality and Democracy Working out its Results.

General Significance. — We now enter upon the last phase of the relationship of nationality and democracy as an organizing idea. The collisions and coöperations between these two mighty forces had worn down the differences separating them so that they now practically moved in harmony. The most fundamental result of this fusion as it worked itself out in national affairs has been the deep and abiding interest taken by the common people. In this phase, for the first time in American history, they

actually came into possession of the machinery of the national government. Heretofore they had been led; now they took the lead or furnished leaders. The tendency toward an aristocracy of office-holders now began to disappear, and new and untried men from among the common people came to the front. No doubt the grade of American statesmanship was lowered by the introduction of so much inexperience, but the thorough nationalization of the common people was a result of immeasurable consequence to our country in the day of its greatest trial. No one can tell what the result might have been in the conflict with slavery had not the common people come to feel that their fate was bound up with that of the nation; that its enemy was their foe, and its helper their friend. The enthusiasm of the masses for the nation grew into full consciousness during this era.

Significance of Jackson's Election. — Old things were passing away and all things were becoming new. In nothing is the change so evident as in the campaign which elected Jackson in 1828. Some of its methods and characteristics were foreshadowed in the contest of 1824. The following brief statements will further aid in reaching a correct interpretation of the campaign as a whole.

1. On the part of Jackson's followers the contest opened immediately after the election of Adams, and was, therefore, nearly four years in length. The nominating caucus was gone, and a more popular method was instituted for getting Jackson before the people. The first step his man-

agers took was to get him recommended to the people by the legislature of Tennessee in 1825, when Jackson immediately resigned from the senate. By means of correspondence, public meetings were held to endorse this action; the most notable was in Philadelphia in 1826. The apparent spontaneity of the movement is shown by the frequent and pressing invitations to Jackson to address all sorts of bodies in all parts of the country. In 1827 the legislature of Louisiana invited him to join with the people in celebration of the victory of New Orleans. Delegations from distant states united to make this the greatest popular demonstration yet held in America. In 1828 popular enthusiasm took up Jackson's cause, and erected, with appropriate exercises, hickory poles in many parts of the nation to testify their appreciation of his peculiar character. The above methods were in themselves telling arguments addressed to the imagination and feeling of the masses. These brought General Jackson before the people and created a personal interest in him such as they had taken only in their favorite sons in 1824. In the course of this campaign, papers sprung into existence for the special purpose of promoting Jackson's candidacy. In congress the opposition organized to obstruct every movement and measure of Adams' administration. They aimed to discredit him in the eyes of the nation. The student will readily see that these are methods of campaigning not heretofore in use, and though not of the highest order, yet calculated to win the populace.

2. The arguments of the campaign were new and carried

tremendous meaning. In the first place, they did not bear on the relative statesmanship of Jackson and Adams. Perhaps the first argument used in the campaign was that Jackson had been cheated out of the presidency by a corrupt bargain between Adams and Clay. There was no truth in the charge as was demonstrated, but Jackson and his campaigners never ceased to reiterate the story, and no doubt it was believed by hundreds of thousands of small-minded people. A second reason urged in favor of Jackson was that congress had violated the democratic spirit in electing Adams. Jackson had received a larger vote, both popular and electoral, than any other candidate. This, said Jackson men, should have determined the matter. The significance of this argument lies in its contrast with the way Jefferson and his followers would have argued. They would have said there are two modes of electing a president; the Constitution does not even suggest that the results of one mode shall determine the result for the other. But Jacksonian democracy exalts the temporary opinion of the people above the Constitution, and therefore throws strict construction to the winds. The meaning of this with reference to nationalization is very clear when we recall that the method by which Adams was elected is the very essence of state sovereignty itself; a cardinal doctrine of the Confederation period and of the Jeffersonian democracy was the equality of the states. Perhaps the most effective argument with the masses was that General Jackson himself was a man sprung from their own class, while President Adams and his supporters were a different

sort of people altogether, and had little or nothing in common with them. Adams and Clay in particular, they held, belonged to a sort of office-holding aristocracy that had aimed to perpetuate itself by the congressional caucus, the succession of secretaries, limited suffrage, and the legislative election of the electoral college. By these methods the great body of citizens were kept from exerting their legitimate influence on the nation's policy. On the other hand, they said, General Jackson is supported by the people and is one of them; so he was born, so he was reared, and such has been his career. In his military capacity he has ever been the friend and the idol of the common soldiers; he shared their hardships on the march and in the camp, and in battle was their leader. We, therefore, want him for our president; he will indeed be the people's president, and will use the government for their good. There was much truth and some error in this sort of argument, but the significant thing is that the plain people of the West and South, in portions of the middle states, and the artisans in the large cities were powerfully taken by such appeals. They longed to see themselves, in the person of Andrew Jackson, in possession of the great office, and the result was in harmony with their feelings, for Jackson received nearly a hundred more electoral votes than Adams. No doubt the unselfish resolution of Adams to make no effort in his own behalf, especially by the use of patronage, contributed to Jackson's majority. By 1828 the non-democratic elements in the southern states had begun to desert the National Republicans; but it is very

apparent that the campaign as a whole indicates the coming supremacy of the people.

Jackson's Rule Interpreted. — This has been done partly, since the campaign aided in determining the lines of administration. The method and details were partly determined by the men composing the administration. The cabinet contained no man of statesmanlike ability, with the possible exception of Van Buren. Jackson dominated it completely, and directed its work with the same vigor and despatch as he had displayed in conducting Indian campaigns; he was the administration. In addition to his military spirit, Jackson possessed, in an intensified way, the strength and weakness of a frontier farmer. He recognized but two classes of men, — friends and enemies; these were always personal and never political. He felt that men of wealth had been favored by the government; the plain people, the farmers and the artisans, had been neglected, and now their time had come. In trying to get at the true meaning of the events and measures of this administration, as little attention as possible will be given to details.

1. The inauguration was simply a continuation of the campaign; the noisy demonstrations attending the event proved that the people came to see themselves inaugurated. No such scenes, no such crowds, and no such people had ever before been drawn to witness the ceremonies. One compared it to the invasion of Rome by the Goths and Vandals, another to the reign of King Mob, and Webster said the crowd acted as if they thought the country had

been "rescued from some dreadful danger." It was significant that nearly all the Jackson editors in the country were there.

2. The wholesale removals from office was the first startling event. Spoilsmen in and out of the cabinet no doubt hastened it, but it had to come, for it was the logic of events as interpreted by the president. He plainly said, and more deeply felt, that the demonstration of public sentiment in the election imposed upon him the duty of reforming the federal patronage. In view of principles controlling all his predecessors, especially the retiring executive, and in view of the tendency of the campaign just closed, reform of patronage could mean but one thing, —the substitution of the friends of the administration and of the people for those in office. The immediate and disastrous consequences to individuals and to the service were either not seen or not appreciated. About the only good result of the new departure was to interest the common people more thoroughly in national affairs, and thus give them a fuller appreciation of the way in which the nation is related to them. The basis of this interest may have been selfish, but it had to have a beginning; that it rose above the mere greed of office and partisan success is well attested by the sacrifices made by the people to save the nation in 1861. What if they had not been educated into an affection for the nation by a generation of political experience? However, it began to appear that no national movement, where numbers count, can ever be successful without the backing of the new democracy.

3. In his message to congress in December of 1829, Jackson opened his long fight against the United States Bank. Whether he thus early believed the bank guilty of participating in politics, or whether he conceived a dislike for the president of the bank for his independent and courageous defence of it, it is significant that Jackson said it was "considered unconstitutional by a large portion of our fellow-citizens." The Supreme Court had decided it constitutional, but that did not matter since the highest court — the people — thought it unconstitutional. This sounds like the claim made by Jackson's friends when congress elected Adams in the face of a plurality of the popular vote for Jackson. In this same message, Jackson suggested a national bank, presumably under the control of the treasury department, and thus subject to the new tribunal, — the people. In his message to congress in 1831, Jackson said he had disclosed his opinions concerning the bank, "in order that the attention of the legislature and the people" should be called to it, and now proposed "to leave it for the present to the investigation of an enlightened people and their representatives." This repeated reference to the people is most significant. Benton confesses that the opponents of the bank in congress aimed by their method of attack to "rouse the people, and prepare them to sustain the veto." Among other things the veto said: "But when the laws undertake to add . . . artificial distinction, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society, the farmers,

mechanics, and laborers, . . . have a right to complain of the injustice of their government. . . . If sustained by my fellow-citizens I shall be grateful and happy. . . ."

4. The campaign of 1832 was, in its methods, an evolution of that of 1828, and in its issues, mainly a continuation of the bank controversy. Jackson had already recommended amending the Constitution to secure the election of the president by a direct vote of the people, and to make him ineligible for reëlection. But it did not take much manœuvering to produce a "spontaneous" demand for his reëlection. A suggestion was now offered that Jackson be nominated at a great national convention of the party. This brought the selection of president one step nearer the people, and was so in harmony with the spirit of the times that all three parties held nominating conventions. This campaign gained a still deeper hold on the feelings of the people. There were day parades with fife, drum, and banners, night demonstrations with torchlight processions and transparencies, pole-raisings, speeches, banquets, pamphlets, cartoons, and other features of later-day campaigns. In originating this sort of political argument the Democrats far excelled the Whigs. The defeat of Clay and the bank was overwhelming, the electoral vote being 219 to 49 in favor of Jackson. The new court had rendered another decision, and Jackson carried an order for the bank's annihilation. His message in December, 1832, questioned the safety of the national deposits, and said that rumors, widely current, called for an investigation. The investigation exonerated the bank, congress

gave it a vote of confidence, but the president ordered the deposits removed, in 1833, to certain state banks. To a secretary opposing the removal, the president said: "My object is to save the country; it will be lost if we permit the bank to exist." The bank began to prepare for the end by contracting its loans, and the beginnings of financial disaster were at hand.

5. The number of state banks rapidly increased, creating greater competition for national deposits. Congress passed an act in 1836 depositing the surplus revenue with the states, subject to recall. Money was thus placed where the people could get it easily; speculation followed; prices, except of public land which was fixed by law, rose rapidly. Hence everybody wished to buy government land to hold for speculation. Thousands of depreciated state-bank notes were received in payment for public land; Jackson became alarmed, and in July, 1836, issued the circular ordering that specie alone be accepted for land. Gold and silver moved westward, paper money eastward; business was disturbed, and confidence undermined. In the spring of 1837 the crash came.[1] Jackson was just retiring from the presidency, but was yet the real leader of his party. The rank and file were every now and then to hear the old leader's voice speaking through Van Buren.

[1] This is not intended as an adequate explanation of the extent and character of the speculation which took hold of individuals, corporations, and states alike. It does not assume to state all the causes of the explosion, but rather indicates the part which popular sentiment, — the conscious power behind the throne, — acting on congress and the administration, played in the management of the national finances.

6. Although the new administration posed as a mere continuation of the preceding one, had the election been postponed a year even, the name of Jackson could hardly have carried the day. As it was, the popular and electoral vote were both much reduced. Between 1837 and 1840 the people began to distrust the leaders who brought such distress upon the nation. Perhaps they did not recall that, in the main, these leaders had reflected the people's wishes in financial matters. The administration was further separated from the masses who followed Jackson by refusing the relief which public sentiment felt it could furnish, especially the repeal of the specie circular. Van Buren's great remedy, the Independent Treasury, did not strongly appeal to popular favor; it was preventive rather than curative, while the popular demand was for the removal of present distress. The measure brought no immediate support to the administration, for it was generally viewed as a selfish desertion of the country by the government.

The Campaign of 1840. — The significance of this extraordinary campaign lies largely in the fact that the Whig party greatly developed the Jacksonian methods of stirring popular enthusiasm. While this party was far less aristocratic and conservative than the old Federalist, yet, as a rule, it was not nearly so popular in its make-up and measures as its rival. However, in this presidential contest it obtained so tremendous a hold on popular favor that it promised for a time to become the real people's party.

The intense distress produced by the panic, and the apparently indifferent attitude of the administration con-

cerning measures of relief, created dissatisfaction among the rank and file of the Democratic party. They had been taught to believe in the nation's ability to do well or ill by the people. The contrast between Van Buren and Harrison went far toward Whig success. It was not unlike that between Adams and Jackson in 1828. Harrison was the honest western farmer and courageous frontier soldier; Van Buren was the eastern politician, and had always held office; Harrison was one of the people, having their ideas and feelings, and could be trusted to serve them; Van Buren was the "little aristocrat," lived in grand style at Washington, and had forgotten the lessons of Jefferson and Jackson. A popular campaign speech pictured the White House as a royal palace and its occupants feasting as Caesars. The tables in the banquet halls were described with elaborate detail before the gaping multitude. But Harrison, the man of the people, was a product of the log cabin with its plain and frugal life.

In 1837 the Ohio Whig convention nominated Harrison, as in 1825 the legislature of Tennessee named Jackson, and, like him, Harrison began to be pressed by invitations. In 1838 he visited Indiana, the scene of his great victory over the Indians in 1811, and set the people on fire. Clubs and battle anniversaries became the order of the day, till the national Whig convention named him in preference to Clay, Webster, or Scott. And now began in earnest a contest, by the side of which the campaign of 1832 pales into insignificance. Such crowds! Such processions! Such enthusiasm! The Harrison demonstra-

tions numbered all the way from a few to a hundred thousand. People traveled hundreds of miles to be present on such occasions, and processions were days upon the road. The log cabin with its latch string out, the raccoon, the barrel of cider on tap, the rolling ball, and the roasted ox played leading parts in rousing popular enthusiasm. To these were added, for the first time, "taking" campaign songs, which were widely employed in stimulating patriotic and partisan zeal. In all this the Whigs far excelled the Democrats, as the election demonstrated. Nineteen states voted for Harrison and seven for Van Buren, while the electoral vote was 234 to 60 in favor of the Whigs.

The joy of the people was unbounded at finding themselves once more in possession of their own. The Whig statesmen now spoke with the same authority as did Jackson in 1828 and 1832. Listen to Clay as he speaks to the Senate in December, 1840, on the repeal of the independent-treasury bill: "The nation wills the repeal of the measure, the nation decrees the repeal of the measure, and the nation commands the repeal of the measure, and the representatives of nineteen states were sent here instructed to repeal it." This reveals the immense distance separating the new from the old Federalism, and how completely nationality has identified itself with democracy, just as Jackson proved the close identity of democracy and nationality.

An Era of National Pride. — The vast expenditure of energy during this period was not confined to political and

economic problems. From the organization of the government the American people had been under the spell of intense activity. The marvelous results wrought out caused a corresponding elevation of national pride. No doubt much of this feeling was shallow and bombastic; but on the whole, it was based on solid achievement. We were becoming proud of our past, and were not insensible to the fact that foreigners were beginning to notice our people and their institutions. Conscious of great things already achieved, and of the possibility of still greater achievements, Americans in this age hotly resented the one-sided criticism of foreigners like Dickens and Trollope.

Perhaps nothing, in a quiet way, made Americans prouder of their nation than its long list of celebrated names. Besides the revolutionary celebrities, the last of whom were rapidly passing away, and the military and naval heroes of 1812, the imaginations and hearts of the people were filled by the splendid abilities of the statesmen who still moved in their midst. But the list included more than warriors and statesmen; men were now springing into prominence in every field of activity. Longfellow, Whittier, and Holmes were joining Irving, Cooper, and Bryant in the field of literature, and Bancroft, our first great historian, was beginning his herculean labors; while Webster's Dictionary was already raising the standard of national speech. Emerson was a rising philosopher and poet whose American pride rebelled against the worship of European formalism and tradition. Kent and Story were occupying the field of jurisprudence with masterly

pens, and writers upon economics and political science were coming forward. Science was beginning to count some great names among eastern institutions, and already one polar expedition had done its work and returned with its story of adventure and discovery. In the field of journalism activity and success were even more marked. Now came into existence those mighty engines of public opinion, — the great metropolitan newspapers. They were much like the politicians of the era in that they tried to reflect the life of the people. Therefore they became really newsy papers, and at first, selling at a penny, their circulation increased enormously. In New York city the *Sun*, the *Herald*, and the *Tribune* set the fashion of the new departure. Before this advent political opinion had been largely molded by the party organ located at Washington city, and dependent for its existence on administrative favors ; but the new paper was more independent, resting on the public for support, dictating policies and measures for the administration.

These mighty forces were producing a body of common thought and sentiment, creating a solidarity of interests in all sections and among all classes that even slavery could not destroy. Such was the function of the period from 1789 to 1840, and such was the result. Many facts touching this result could not be discussed. Important among these were the extension of suffrage, the growth of the government's land policy, increase of immigration, party organization, increase of inventions, and the diffusion of wealth.

Development of the Conflict.

Origin of the Struggle. — The mutual conquest of nationality and democracy reached its fruition between 1820 and 1840. Had not slavery blocked the way, these two mighty forces, now made one, would have carried the nation rapidly forward to that greatness attained only in our day. The new struggle differed from the old in that it was a struggle to the death, and although compromises were made, they only postponed the fatal day.

The earliest struggle of far-reaching importance occurred in the constitutional convention. It arose over questions of representation, direct taxation, and commerce. The immediate cause was the fact that the slave states had a smaller white population than the free states, and hence would be in a minority in the lower house of congress. But why? Did not the slave states have a richer soil and a more genial climate than the free states? Slavery was hostile to population; it occupied vast estates, built few towns, encouraged but one occupation, — agriculture, — brought the white laborer into competition with labor consuming the coarsest food and clothes, built no public schools, and put a social ban upon the non-slaveholder.

For these reasons there was a tendency, in early times, to avoid the South, and even leave it for the North. The tendency became a movement only in this century. After a fierce battle the convention agreed to count three-fifths of the slave population for both representatives and direct taxes. The South was predominantly agricultural, and, because of slavery, had only a narrow range of agriculture. The South feared commercial restrictions by the North, and the latter opposed the African slave-trade. The spirit in which these contests were waged is seen in the repeated threats of delegates from the Carolinas and Georgia to oppose the ratification of the Constitution.

The weakness which forced slavery to fight in self-defence, and the spirit in which it conducted the contest, constitute the fundamental causes of the struggle between nationality and slavery. These inhere in the system itself, and from the constitutional convention to the Missouri Compromise were operating against slavery. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars made life burdensome to Europeans, and they began to come to America. Where did they go? To the North. At the same time the slender stream of non-slaveholders, emigrating north and north-westward, was growing wider and deeper. The result of this movement of population is seen in the growing difference in the number of congressmen from the two sections. In 1790 the difference was but four in favor of the North; in 1800 the census showed this to be twelve; in 1810 it had grown to twenty-five; while by 1820, the period of the Missouri conflict, the gulf had widened to forty-three.

In spite of the three-fifths advantage, slavery had hopelessly lost power in the House. The inevitable was seen approaching, and the battle for the balance of power had long been transferred to the Senate. The states are equal here, population counting little. Since 1789 a sort of equilibrium had been maintained by the admission of states. Seven of the thirteen states were free or becoming so in 1789, and six were slave. The admission of Kentucky, Vermont, and Tennessee established an equilibrium. Ohio destroyed it in 1802, and Louisiana restored it in 1812. Indiana in 1816, Mississippi in 1817, Illinois in 1818, and Alabama in 1819 alternately destroyed and restored this political equality. But in this last year Missouri applied for admission as a slave state. The North took the alarm; it was not slavery's turn, and, if permitted, would give it a majority of two senators, — enough to block legislation and the admission of new states. Besides, slavery had encroached geographically upon the North, for at least four-fifths of the eastern boundary of this state rests against a free state. Further significance is given to the Missouri application by remembering that there are but two more slave territories, — Arkansas and Florida. Aside from the political questions involved, here are aggressions that the free states feel must be resisted. Another significant fact is that the necessity of this aggressive action lies in the defects of slavery itself.

The spirit in which slavery conducted the controversy over Missouri is made clearer by its attitude in the case of the early petitions sent to congress against the institution.

These were generally, in Washington's administration, presented by Quakers, requesting congress to use its constitutional powers to place some restriction on slavery. The spirit of the institution is revealed in the following arguments in its defence: 1. The Quakers were denounced as hypocrites and cowards. 2. The petitions were unconstitutional, because violating guarantees on which the South ratified the Constitution. 3. Emancipation was a curse, and would lead to civil war. 4. The Bible and the southern clergy were not opposed to slavery. 5. The South could be cultivated by negroes only. 6. The slave-trade was a benefit to the negro. The language was more intemperate even than the arguments, and both were repeated in all the conflicts between 1820 and 1860.[1]

[1] The slaveholder was a product of his environment, and a different product would not have resulted if the people of the North had been inhabitants of the South from colonial days. The spirit born of the system is well stated by Jefferson: "There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this and learn to imitate it. . . . If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self-love for restraining the intemperance of his passion toward his slave, it should be a sufficient one that his child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose rein to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it."— *Notes on the State of Virginia*, pp. 169–170.

Meaning of the Missouri Struggle.[1] — The content of this event has been partly indicated. The effect on public sentiment remains to be noted. This will be best understood in the light of the characterizing features of the event. The fight opened by proposing to prohibit the further carrying of slaves into Missouri, and to free all its future-born slaves upon reaching the age of twenty-five. The conflict lasted two years and excited the earnest attention of both sections. Another feature of significance is found in the depth of thought and passion stirred. Feeling ran high in congress, and wild scenes were enacted; resistance was hinted, civil war was prophesied, and threats of secession were frequently made. The public participated in the excitement; meetings were held in town and city; county and state conventions, grand juries and legislatures joined in resolutions and protests. Northern congressmen, in some instances, were burned in effigy by their irate constituents. Others had to explain or defend their votes.

The effects of the battle may be summarized about as follows: 1. The South gained Missouri, but Maine was admitted, thus preserving the balance of power in the Senate. 2. The South lost all territory north of the southern boundary line of Missouri, thus apparently

[1] Aside from the congressional debates, one of the best summaries of the arguments presented is found in Von Holst, vol. i. pp. 358–370. Schurz's *Clay*, vol. i. pp. 192–200, gives an interesting interpretation of the event. McMaster, vol. iv. pp. 570–600, shows the manifestations of popular sentiment over the affair.

cramping herself beyond recovery. 3. The compromise, in effect, decided that congress could prohibit slavery in territories, thus establishing the principle of the future Free Soil platform. 4. The South learned that the weak point in the North's armor was the fear of a dissolution of the Union. 5. Threats of disunion carried ominous meaning because both sections began to be conscious of the deep-seated differences separating them. Patriotic men like Jefferson and Clay were profoundly alarmed over the situation; but after the end came, public interest and excitement quickly disappeared. There was yet no consciousness of an irrepressible conflict. 6. The progress of pro-slavery sentiment in the South since 1787 is seen in the fact that no anti-slavery advocate appeared among her congressmen, while Virginia delegates in the constitutional convention and others were not friends to slavery.

Slavery Nullifies the Tariff. — The significance of the contest between the nation and South Carolina is found in the above heading. With reference to its causes and motives, nullification was primarily an economic and social event; secondarily, a political one. The people generally looked upon it as merely a factional opposition to escape the payment of the tariff. Some believed the tariff only an excuse, and that the assertion and execution of the doctrine of nullification was the real motive of the leaders. A small number have looked upon it as a struggle between leaders of factions in the Democratic party. These are superficial interpretations of the events and circumstances making up the situation.

The disappearance from the South of opposition to slavery and the rise of a strong pro-slavery sentiment were due to the vast development of the cotton industry during the first quarter of this century. English invention had aided in creating a demand for cotton; Whitney's gin enabled the South to meet that demand. These new conditions gave slavery a fresh lease of life by making it profitable. It must be noted that the growth was mainly along old lines, — merely an expansion of southern agriculture. In this period no new industries were born in the South, and she failed to diversify and render American industry independent of European competition. The inability of slavery to profit by the tariff was not apparent to southern leaders in 1816, for Calhoun, among others, was then a warm advocate of it. The experiment with protection from 1816 to 1828 revealed to leading thinkers of the South the startling fact that slavery was not only unable to take advantage of the tariff, but was, as they thought, greatly injured by it. Very few men from the cotton states voted for protection in 1824 and 1828; but in spite of this opposition, the tariff gradually rose till the climax was reached in 1828.

The cry arose, How can the South protect her industrial system? This question ought to be translated to read: How can slavery be extricated from the position in which it has placed itself? In searching for a shield for slavery and its interests, it was found in the old dogma of state sovereignty, which had done service in former days for both Republicans and Federalists. The theory of the

Kentucky and Virginia resolutions was now to receive a new interpretation. Calhoun elaborated this doctrine for his people by his famous "South Carolina Exposition" in 1828. He pointed out a supposed permanent dissimilarity between the "staple states" and the remainder of the nation. This rests, he held, on differences in soil, climate, habits, and peculiar labor.[1] The remedy against legislation injurious to these interests is a veto of it by the state. The next step in the process was the Webster-Hayne debate in 1830. Hayne promulgated in congress the doctrine of state sovereignty, with its accompanying "compact" theory of the national Constitution, and nullification as a rightful and peaceable remedy. Hayne spoke for the past, for slavery was of the past. Webster's argument embodied all the mighty evolution of national life, both actual and potential. He spoke for the future, for nationality was of the future. To casual observers this seemed a repetition of the old struggle between nationality and state sovereignty, but was fundamentally a hand-to-hand combat between nationality and slavery. The next move was to commit Jackson to the new movement by surrounding him with a nullification atmosphere at the Jefferson banquet; but his volunteer toast, "The federal Union, it must be

[1] This statement was generally accepted then, and is often believed true now; but it is easy to see that slavery alone put the South in a position where it could not profit by the national policy of protection. Soil, climate, and natural products alone would not have created dissimilar and conflicting interests. The proof of this is found in the development of diversified industries in the South to-day.

preserved," was the end of their hopes. Disappointed in Jackson, Calhoun issued "An Appeal to the People of South Carolina," in July, 1831, in which he restated, in stronger terms and with more elaboration than in the "Exposition," the doctrines of nullification. In and out of congress it was felt that a crisis could be avoided only by a reduction of the tariff. This was done in 1832, but the principle of protection was preserved. Once more the great leader seized his pen, and emphasized the right of the state to nullify an act of congress deemed injurious to its interests.

The legislature called a state convention, and in November of 1832 the famous ordinance was passed nullifying the tariffs of 1828 and 1832. Provisions were made for executing the decree by force, if necessary. Jackson promptly issued his great proclamation demolishing the doctrine of nullification, and declaring his resolution to enforce the laws of the nation. Clay's compromise tariff probably prevented a collision between the state and national forces. The great bulk of the nation, irrespective of party, applauded the president. State legislatures promptly condemned the conduct of South Carolina. Nullification as a peaceful remedy was discredited; it could be applied only at the point of the bayonet. Nationality was strengthened in Jackson's party, especially in the North and West. In the midst of the noise and excitement, few persons saw slavery masquerading in the disguise of state sovereignty. Fewer still saw that the compromise did not go to the root of the matter, and that the real cause of the trouble was still operative.

Meaning of the Movement for Texas. — This is the old question in a new form: How can slavery escape its own ills? There are two reasons why it must have Texas. First, the wear and tear of the system in the old states was so enormous that new lands must be had to enable it to prosper. Second, the South needed more votes in the Senate, especially since the anti-slavery movement was growing. The method was simple and the steps few. Slaveholders emigrated to Texas for one or both of these reasons. Mexico abolished slavery. The American slaveholders in Texas refused to submit, raised the standard of revolt, issued a declaration of independence, and defeated the Mexicans by the aid of citizens of the United States, who forwarded both munitions and men.[1] Mexico refused to ratify Texan independence which Sam Houston wrung from Santa Anna at San Jacinto in 1835. A government was organized and application made for admission to the United States. Jackson and the South favored the application, but feared northern sentiment. Petitions from the North poured in on congress against annexation. The South tried to make it a national question by arguing for an extension of the national domain; calling for its "reannexation," asserting it was once a part of the Louisiana purchase and needlessly given up; appealing to prejudice against England, which was represented as intriguing with the new republic.

In spite of all these reasons, opposition at the North steadily grew, and forced the postponement of annexation during the administration of Van Buren and the greater

[1] The author does not enumerate all the causes of the Texan revolution.

part of Tyler's. When annexation did come in 1845, the two sections were gradually becoming conscious of a growing contrariety of interests. From this time on, if not from an earlier date, every question of importance was viewed by the American people in its relation to slavery. The process of sectionalization had begun in earnest.

The Growth of Sectionalization.

The Process already Begun. — The beginnings of new movements frequently find their opportunity at the point of triumph of older movements. In the decade from 1830 to 1840, democracy and nationality triumphed together. While these two forces were reveling in their mutual victory, sectionalization was already raising its head.

We have already discovered that the active and aggressive cause of this movement was an inherent weakness in slavery itself; that an attempt to overcome this led to the political and economic conflicts over the admission of Missouri, the nullification of the tariff, and the annexation of Texas; and that slavery sought out state sovereignty as its shield of defence. This forced the nation and the section into conflict.

The above contests gave opportunity to the opponents of slavery on moral and religious grounds. This old enemy slavery affected to despise, but it was the most dangerous of all, because not influenced by political considerations, and was likely to be most persistent and radical. The proof that both sections were becoming conscious of increasing

differences of interests and ideas is found in the following points:

1. It is revealed in speeches of leading men. John Quincy Adams on annexation: "Your trial is approaching. The spirit of freedom and the spirit of slavery are drawing together for a deadly conflict of arms. . . . Young men of Boston, burnish up your armor and prepare for the conflict." Jackson pronounced this "a direct appeal to arms" to oppose the annexation of Texas. Several, in speaking on the subject, said: "To increase the slaveholding power is to subvert the Constitution: to give a fearful preponderance which may, and probably will, be speedily followed by demands to which the democratic free-labor states cannot yield, and the denial of which will be made the ground of secession, nullification, and disunion." The *South Carolinian* in 1844 said: "This question absorbs all others. . . . Whigs and Democrats drop all their old party differences and unite on it like brothers. . . . This is a question not of *party*, but of *country*, and to the South one of absolute *self-preservation*. . . . The only hope of the South is in herself." Similar sentiments are found in a few other papers. A call for a convention of the friends of annexation was issued by these papers. Their motto was: "Texas with, or Texas without, the Union." The idea of a convention of slave states was born, but did not materialize.

2. The movement toward sectionalization is seen again in the rapid rise at the North of anti-slavery sentiment, which, in its aggressive beginning, ran parallel to the

attempt of the South to beat down the tariff, and maintain its supremacy in the Senate by seizing and annexing Texas. Lundy, with his *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, and Garrison, with his *Liberator*, had prepared the way for the organization of the enemies of slavery into the American Anti-Slavery Society (1833). From now on, this organization, with an increasing number of state societies, demanded the abolition of slavery. To this end it tried to educate public sentiment in many ways, but most effectively by pouring petitions into congress against the slave-trade, slavery in the District of Columbia, and the annexation of Texas. The success of annexation led to a rapid decline of the anti-slavery opposition based on political consideration, but it left in the North a very great increase in the number of determined abolitionists.

3. A third evidence of the progress of this anti-national process is found in the congressional battle over the right of petition. From Washington's administration, the slaveholders showed much sensitiveness over petitions relating to slavery. Now they gave an enormous impulse to the anti-slavery cause by refusing any sort of hearing to such appeals. This made anti-slavery men into abolitionists, thoughtful men into enemies of slavery, and indifferent men into thoughtful ones. The increase of anti-slavery petitions led to the passage of the gag resolutions as a means of suppressing them; but the rising tide of opposition, led by John Quincy Adams, finally beat down this barrier in 1844. Not only did the North hate slavery more for its willingness to override the most sacred constitutional

rights, but also because it exhibited almost unbearable intolerance toward the old hero who waged the battle against its aggression.

4. In 1840 a new party — the Liberty — was born, and cast nearly seven thousand votes for abolition. In 1844 its vote ran up to over sixty thousand, being joined this year by several thousand anti-slavery Whigs. This vote defeated Henry Clay for the presidency. The feeling which led several thousand Whigs in New York to ignore party ties and vote against the idol of the party is most significant indeed.

5. In no sphere of activity was the tendency toward denationalization stronger than in the church. One cause of the dissensions among the Presbyterians in 1838 was the growing divergence of opinion on slavery. A battle over slavery was fought in the Methodist Church, resulting in its dismemberment by the secession of the southern conferences in 1844. Men, both North and South, saw that it portended the dissolution of the Union. In this same period the Baptist Church was also rent by the slavery question. Thus were the interests and feelings of the two sections moving away from each other, and making it more impossible each year for the people to act as a nation on questions immediately, or even remotely, connected with slavery. The wedge of separation, driven by the blows of slavery, had entered the Union.

Motive and Results of the Mexican War. — Slavery had annexed Texas, but was not satisfied; its ambition had grown with its opportunity, and was not to stop short

of the Pacific Ocean as its western limit. Two things opened the way: 1. Several million dollars of fraudulent claims against Mexico and a disputed boundary line. Slavery saw in these an opportunity for possessions far more extensive than Texas. Why negotiate for peace when war promised unlimited expansion of slavery to the westward? 2. The diplomatic correspondence and the conduct of the governmental agents of the United States show slavery's determination to have California by peace or war. The order which sent American troops into the disputed territory furnishes additional proof of this, and every victory of the American arms, from Palo Alto to Scott's triumphal entry into the Mexican capital, meant, in the minds of the promoters of the war, more slave territory.

The masses of the people probably did not understand all the relations involved in the war; they supported it mainly from patriotic or military ardor, little conscious that their greatest industrial and social enemy was throwing dust while it sought an impregnable position in the nation. However, the more thoughtful did see the trend of things, if not at the opening of the war, during its progress. The country was warned by abolitionists; and when the president asked, in 1846, for two million dollars to aid in making peace, eyes were opened, and both Whigs and Democrats at the North supported the Wilmot Proviso, which proposed to apply to the possible territory the clause which excluded slavery from the Northwest Territory. Almost without regard to party this measure was supported or opposed, and marks an important step in

denationalization. While Calhoun had opposed the war as dangerous to slavery in the end, now he fought the proviso with all the logic of his powerful mind. He developed before the Senate the doctrine that congress could make no law impairing the right of a citizen to carry his property into the territories. This was a new and aggressive position, and, if supported by the South, would produce a solid North. The Wilmot Proviso was defeated, however, by a small majority, on account of votes given by those who feared a dissolution of the Union, and those who feared no territory at all would be obtained.

The slaveholders began to say that no friend of the Wilmot Proviso could ever be president, while even the northern Democrats, particularly in New York, under the name of Barnburners, began to break away from their southern brethren. This defection was made formidable in 1848, when nearly all anti-slavery factions united on Martin Van Buren under the name of Free Soil party. They asserted it to be the power and duty of congress to protect the territories from slavery. This was embodied in their platform — the principle which was to produce a completer sectionalization of parties than anything yet seen. Calhoun had denied congressional intervention in the territories, the Free Soil party had demanded it. On the part of the North, this was a reassertion of the doctrine of the Ordinance of 1787 touching slavery, the sentiment contained in legislative instructions against the admission of Missouri as a slave state, and the principle of the Wilmot Proviso. It is significant that both of the old

parties refused to commit themselves on this point. The Democrats nominated a northern man, General Cass, and the Whigs a southern man and slaveholder, General Taylor; and both ignored slavery as far as possible. This only proves that each section feared the defection of the other. In spite of this care, Democratic states, like South Carolina, threw their votes for the slaveholding Whig rather than for the non-slaveholding Democrat; Whig Ohio gave over sixteen thousand majority for the Democratic non-slaveholder, besides over thirty-five thousand votes to the Free Soil party; while in Michigan, Taylor's vote was less than Clay's in 1844, although the Democratic gain in four years was less than three thousand. The Free Soil vote in the same time had gained nearly three hundred per cent. Calhoun was right in opposing the Mexican war, and had his opposition included the movement for Texas, he might have prevented the rising hostility of the North.

How the Discovery of Gold in California Aided in Sectionalizing the Nation. — The treaty with Mexico was hardly made before gold was discovered in California. As the news spread over the nation large numbers started for the new land. They forsook all occupations and went by all routes: over the mountains, across the Isthmus, and around the Cape. In 1849 this hardy population organized for statehood. A free-state constitution was adopted by the convention without a dissenting vote on the prohibition of slavery, and it was ratified by a vast majority of the people. The people of the territory had

put the substance of the Wilmot Proviso into their constitution. Thus, by action of the settlers themselves, slavery was deprived of the richest fruit of the war. Why did freedom win in the territory acquired for aid by its rival? Slavery, we have seen, was immobile; it had a scanty white population, and was tied, as it were, to the soil. It had no emigrants to spare, and if it had, they must have carried slaves as well as themselves. Therefore California was lost by slavery itself. The same old cause forced and lost the battle as in the days of the constitutional convention, the struggle for Missouri, and in the fight over the tariff and nullification. This experience ought to have convinced Calhoun that congressional non-intervention would not save slavery in the territories.

The slaveholders were furious over the prospect of not only losing the Mexican cessions for slavery, but of its being added to freedom's growing power. Great southern Whigs like Stephens and Toombs began now to coöperate with slaveholding Democrats in resisting this result. Eight southern Whigs deserted the caucus of their party because it refused to resolve against legislation on the subject of slavery. The Free Soilers refused also to support the Whig nominee for Speaker. During the three weeks' contest over the Speakership, it was no unusual thing for southern congressmen to declare that the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso, or the abolition of slavery in the District, would be a sufficient cause of disunion. The fear of this caused the North to weaken, and a slaveholder was elected Speaker by a few votes.

The Compromise of 1850. — This event, as an effect, embodies the results flowing from the annexation of Texas and the Mexican war. As a phase of public sentiment it is the first conscious crisis in the process of sectionalization. How the consciousness of this crisis arose and expressed itself furnishes the first half of the content of this important event. Had not the conviction that the Union was in danger been deeply grounded, no such compromise would have been possible. It is not necessary here to detail the provisions of the compromise, or explain how the bill as such did not pass, while its leading provisions became law.

The struggle in congress was unusually significant. The champions of the old order of things were met by leaders of a new *régime*. Clay and Webster stood for the Union. This was certainly Clay's dominant motive, and the spirit and zeal of his appeals prove the depth of his conviction that the Union was in danger from both northern and southern radicals. Webster was also powerfully impelled by the same noble desire in his famous "seventh of March speech." Whether his severer strictures upon anti-slavery agitators than upon pro-slavery radicals were due to his desire to be president rather than to strengthen the Union is a disputed question. To the old leaders and to most of their followers, the Union had been almost everything, and its destruction seemed to threaten chaos. The speeches of these two men attracted wide-spread attention, and called hundreds to Washington to hear them. The significance of Calhoun's speech was in the emphasis

placed upon equal political power between the two sections as the condition upon which the South could remain in the Union. This was a condition impossible of fulfillment. First, because the North would not agree to it. Second, because, even if such an agreement was reached, it could not be maintained for the reason that it proposed to make a minority equal to a majority. Slavery made the South a minority section; in respect to population, industry, education, and all that constitutes progressive civilization, slavery forced the South into a position of increasing inferiority. Every decade would have revealed the growing injustice of such a plan of peace.

In these debates appeared the champions of a new cause. Here men like Seward and Chase, having broken from the traditions of the old parties on slavery, spoke for freedom and the future. Here it was that the former announced the "higher law," which constituted his most significant utterance. He held that compromises would avail nothing, and that slavery should be dealt with for the highest good of the people. Seward was the representative of an increasing number of northern Whigs; hence the alarm of the South at the doctrines announced in his speech. This alarm was deepened by the way Webster was berated in New England for his part in the great debate.

The passage of the leading measures of the compromise seemed to allay agitation for a time. "Union" meetings were held in various parts of the nation, at which both Whigs and Democrats appeared to promote fraternal rela-

tions between the sections. The rising sentiment in the South in favor of secession subsided somewhat. A convention of states was held in Nashville in June, 1850, but few representatives were present and little unanimity found. The most significant thing was the fact that the convention was held. It met again in November and asserted the right of secession, but this represented only radical southern opinion, and met no general response.

Both of the old parties tried hard to support the compromise as a "finality." Resolutions in caucus and before congress served rather to divide the Whig party. In state conventions the compromise was generally supported, and in both the great national conventions of 1852 it received renewed pledges of fidelity. But it was felt that the Whigs were less in earnest than the Democrats; many southern Whigs, therefore, supported their old opponents. The Free Soil vote of 1852 was greatly reduced as compared with 1848, but was more than double that of 1844.

The Kansas-Nebraska Bill. — The overwhelming success of the Democrats still added to the delusion that the great compromise was a finality; but the South could not forget its loss of California nor the North forgive the fugitive-slave law. The execution of this law exasperated the abolitionists, and led states to pass laws which greatly limited its efficiency. This conduct was indefensible in a legal sense, and was practical nullification. Only moral ground — the "higher law" — could be urged in its defence. The compromise of 1850 applied the principle of popular sovereignty to the territories of New Mexico and

Utah. This was the doctrine of congressional non-intervention, leaving, as it did, the question of slavery to be determined by the settlers of the territories.

Early in 1854 Senator Douglas introduced a bill embodying this idea for the organization of the territory now included within Kansas and Nebraska. Not much opposition to the application of non-intervention in 1850 was made by either section, but now it raised a storm in the North which raged till swallowed up by war. The present application was to the territory obtained from Louisiana and devoted to freedom by the Missouri Compromise, which had now stood unassailed for more than a generation. While slavery had not asked this favor, its congressmen, Whigs as well as Democrats, supported the bill, while half the northern Democrats in the House joined the majority of northern Whigs in opposition. The bill's majority was only thirteen, — a most significant vote, considering the great majority held by the administration.

The dissolution of parties outside of congress went on more rapidly than in congress. In the extreme slave states the Whig party rapidly disappeared, while in the North anti-slavery Whigs and Democrats coalesced in opposition to the agressions of slavery. It seemed to the North that slavery, having failed to get possession of California, was making a flank movement to possess all remaining territory. To the South it appeared entirely consistent to apply the principle of non-intervention to all territories alike. The process of sectionalizing politics was powerfully intensified by the effort of the two sections

to get possession of Kansas. Both saw that possession of Kansas was a question of numbers, but they did not at first see that the North alone could win; it had the white population to spare. The South was weakened by a sparse population, and only the slaveholders with their slaves could make Kansas a slave state. The Emigrant Aid Society was an impossible organization for the South. Thus handicapped by the system she would save, her leaders were compelled to resort to force and fraud in setting up a government. The free-state settlers retaliated and civil war broke out. For several years both sections were profoundly agitated by the conflict.

One of the immediate results of the new agitation was the formation of the Republican party. It adopted the principles and absorbed the membership of the Free Soil party; but the largest contingent was furnished by the northern Whigs whose party was practically disbanded. The large accessions from the old parties added that respectability which comes from numbers and experienced leadership. The masses of the voters made the new party more popular in its tendency than had been the Whigs. The leaders were mainly old Whigs and nationalized Democrats, whose views of the Constitution were after the school of Hamilton rather than that of Jefferson. The new party cast more than a million three hundred thousand votes two years later (1856), after the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. It would probably have won had the Know Nothing party been out of the way with its remnant of timid Whigs. The fact of striking significance

in the vote is that less than twelve hundred ballots were cast in the slave states for Frémont, and these only in the border states. Were there only twelve hundred non-slave-holding whites in the South who recognized slavery as their greatest foe? Again, the Democratic party lost all the northern states except New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois, and its total majority in these four states was several thousand less than the total vote of the American party. When this party disappears, will not its vote leave the Democrats sectionalized as far as majorities are concerned?

The Dred Scott Decision. — This rising tide of anti-slavery sentiment was threatening to overflow all bounds. All departments of the government, except the judiciary, had been called in and had failed to find the remedy. Would not the people's profound regard for the purity and dignity of the national judiciary lead them to obey its behests on the slavery question? Would it not be risking too much to drag this noble tribunal into the mad swirl of sectional politics? In 1857 the Supreme Court handed down a decision to the effect that slavery could not be excluded from the territories. The significance of this decision lies in several points: 1. The audacity of the venture. 2. The apparent purpose of the slave power to fasten slavery on Kansas by this means. 3. Its complete nullification of the doctrine of popular sovereignty. 4. The denial of the Free Soil principles of the Republican party, thus asserting it to be hostile to the Constitution. 5. Its utter denial of the right of slaves to be considered even as

citizens in the meaning of the Constitution, and the implication "that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." 6. On account of the inflamed state of the public mind, little respect was paid to the decision, and the fight in Kansas went rapidly forward.

The Lincoln-Douglas Debate. — In the course of events, both parties in Kansas framed constitutions, set up governments, and applied for admission. The administration favored the pro-slavery constitution which had been carried by fraud and violence. It was such a travesty on popular sovereignty that public sentiment forced many Democrats in congress, among them Douglas, to oppose the admission of Kansas with a fraudulent slave constitution. This was the beginning of a breach in the northern Democracy.

In 1858 occurred the Lincoln-Douglas debate, an event carrying far-reaching consequences. The term of Senator Douglas of Illinois was about to expire. He was the idol of the northern Democrats, and was admired by many opponents for his manly stand against forcing a pro-slavery constitution upon Kansas. The Republicans of Illinois nominated Abraham Lincoln as their candidate for the senatorship. Before the nominating convention, Lincoln made his famous house-divided-against-itself speech. Douglas immediately attacked this speech with great spirit. Lincoln challenged him to public debate before the people of Illinois. Seven joint debates were arranged. It was a battle royal, and attracted general attention throughout the United States. Only one question was discussed — slavery. On the first day Douglas set a trap to prove Lincoln an

abolitionist; it consisted of a set of questions so worded that each practically answered itself. Lincoln broke the force of the questions by his skillful answers, and in turn propounded a set of questions which contained two pitfalls, into one of which Douglas must fall or refuse to answer the questions; in case he refused, he would really fall into both. The pivotal question of the set was: "Can the people of a United States territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a state constitution?" "It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the Constitution; the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please." This answer made Douglas senator again, but lost him the presidency, as such doctrine was now wormwood and gall to the South; from now on the differences between the northern and southern Democracy were irreconcilable. Sectionalization of political feeling in the South rapidly hastened to completion.

Other Symptoms of the Triumph of Sectionalization. — From the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill the gulf rapidly widened. The following hastened and at the same time signified this fact: 1. One or more filibustering expeditions between 1850 and 1860 were organized to obtain more slave soil. Expeditions against the following points were either attempted or planned: Cuba, Mexico, and Central America. These expeditions were encouraged by the

Ostend "manifesto," which recommended either the purchase or the conquest of Cuba. Coming as it did from the deliberations of the American ministers to Spain, France, and England, it had great weight with the South. 2. Another symptom was the growing conviction that the conflict between the North and the South was an irrepressible one. This idea was formulated by Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech, June, 1858, and by Seward in his celebrated Rochester speech in October of the same year.[1] The universal attention given these speeches proves that they accurately diagnosed the situation. 3. The most startling of the current symptoms was the John Brown raid. He startled the southern people. They fully believed that the majority of the North sympathized with or aided the expedition. Nothing proves so completely the total misunderstanding between the two sections. 4. Among the many signs of the rapid sectionalization of interests and sentiments may be counted the frequent con-

[1] Lincoln's statement: "'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved, I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, North as well as South."

Seward's statement: "They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free-labor nation."

ventions in the South for the discussion of its peculiar interests. Such meetings were held at Knoxville, Montgomery, Vicksburg, and at other places. The reopening of the foreign slave-trade was fully discussed in these meetings and carried in the affirmative. The more visionary papers of the South saw in this, not only the recovery of the states lost, but the universal sway of slavery in the nation.

The Meaning of the Charleston Convention. — In 1860 the Democrats met in Charleston, S. C., to nominate a candidate for the presidency. Before the meeting convened it was becoming evident that the northern delegates were determined to stand by Douglas, while the southern delegates were just as determined to repudiate him. This situation was largely the result of the Lincoln-Douglas debate. Not only the man but his principles had become distasteful and dangerous to slavery. Slavery had hailed non-intervention and popular sovereignty with every manifestation of approval. But the Kansas-Nebraska struggle and Douglas' answers to Lincoln's questions had taught that these principles in practice gave slavery no hope, and were as dangerous as congressional intervention or prohibition. Douglas and his platform were of no more service to slavery than were Lincoln and his Free Soil platform. This was true. But the real reason is found, not in Douglas, but in the defects of slavery itself.

The southern delegates demanded that the convention declare, among other things, that neither congress nor the territorial legislature has the right to abolish slavery in the territories or to impair the right of property in slaves, and

that it is the duty of the federal government to protect the rights of person and property wherever its jurisdiction extends. This was a blow aimed at Douglas and his northern supporters. The latter knew their constituents would resent it and disrupt the party. Holding a majority, the Douglas delegates rejected the demands of the South; the latter withdrew and organized a rival convention, which subsequently nominated Breckenridge for president, thus practically sectionalizing the great Democratic party.

Douglas' supporters, deeply resenting this disunion, called a new convention and nominated their favorite. The Republicans named Lincoln; the Constitutional Union party, Bell. The result of the canvass was the defeat of Douglas and the election of Lincoln. The popular vote shows how completely the Union was divided. Out of nearly two million votes, the Republicans received a few more than twenty-five thousand from the border slave states. Douglas, likewise, out of nearly a million three hundred thousand, received about one hundred sixty thousand votes from the slave states. The North cast less than one hundred thousand for Breckenridge and about eighty thousand for Bell, most of whose vote was southern. There were thus practically two northern and two southern parties.

One consequence of the conduct of the Charleston convention and of the result of the campaign remains to be considered. The slaughter of Douglas in the house of his friends, and at the hands of those he had so long and so faithfully served, was looked upon by his supporters as a

piece of deepest perfidy. With a courage born of despair, Douglas fought out the campaign till the "October states" showed the certainty of Lincoln's election. He cancelled his dates in the North and turned southward. On the stump, in private correspondence, and at every opportunity he declared for the Union and against secession. On his return to congress, while southern states were seceding, southern congressmen hurling defiance at the Union in parting speeches, and threats of Lincoln's assassination were heard in Washington, Douglas stood boldly for the Union, and answered seceding congressmen in language they could not misunderstand. At Lincoln's inauguration he stood near and commended the fearless though gentle words of his late opponent. At the inauguration ball he escorted Mrs. Lincoln in the presence of the capital's *élite*, which was then largely southern in its sympathies. When Lincoln's call to arms went forth, there accompanied it the announcement of Douglas' enthusiastic support. This was a summons to patriotic duty of the million northern voters who had just followed him to political defeat. Their time had come. On April 25, 1861, occurred a remarkable scene in the capital of Illinois. The members of a Republican legislature, once his unrelenting enemies, were now, in the home of Abraham Lincoln, giving Stephen A. Douglas a most enthusiastic ovation, and were hanging on his words as if he were a political prophet after their own heart. In a little more than a week the country was startled by the news of his death. But along with this went the description of the deathbed scene, in which the

dying patriot appealed to his sons to be true to the Constitution and the Union. This was regarded as another summons to his patriotic followers to respond to their country's call. How nobly the War-Democrats kept this last appeal history gladly tells. These last events of his life were the noblest of his career and were inspired by his love of the Union, and the memory of his treatment at the hands of slavery did not cause him to withhold his influence or check his enthusiasm for the nation's defence. Thus again did slavery raise up the agents of its own destruction.

The Significance of Secession.— The secession conventions of the southern states were the sign, looking backward, that sectionalization was practically complete; that the interests and feelings of the North endangered the existence of slavery. Looking forward, they signified the determination of slavery to save itself outside of the Union. Secession was not primarily for the purpose of vindicating the principle of state sovereignty. It is true that the act of secession sought its defence in this doctrine; the southern leaders often put it forward with much earnestness, and no doubt many honest people thought the primary purpose of the movement was the defence of the old Jeffersonian doctrine. This ostensible motive was kept to the front by the method of secession. Frequently the governor summoned, by an alarming proclamation, the legislature in extra session. Usually this body, after providing means for the defence of the state, called a convention of the people which should pass upon the subject

of secession. Thus secession was generally decreed by a body of people supposed to possess the attribute of sovereignty. The reason for the prominence given to state sovereignty is partly explained by the fact that in some states many non-slaveholders were unwilling to promote the interests of slavery and yet were devoted to state sovereignty. Looking forward to the meaning of secession as seen in its consequences, we readily see that it involves war. While the South was contemplating separation, its leaders were preparing for war, and yet they tried to convince themselves and their people that war would not follow. It was inevitable. The national life developed between 1789 and 1860 had become so complex and its organs so interdependent that it touched almost every human interest. Although sectionalization was so complete, yet when this sought to express itself in actual overt acts, it was found impossible to do so without a collision of interests.

How hard the North tried to save the Union without a collision of arms may be partly seen in the new compromises offered to slavery. The work of both houses of congress during the winter of 1860 and 1861 was mainly consumed in seeing how far the North would make concession. The proof that the Republicans were willing to make concessions in conflict with their platform is found in the provisions of the Crittenden Compromise, in the resolutions of the Committee of Thirty-three, in the work of the Peace convention, and in the opening, by legislation, of the territories without restrictions upon slavery. It was all in vain.

The Destruction of Slavery and the Triumph of the Nation.

Significance of Slavery's Appeal to Arms. — How different was the progress of the struggle between nationality and democracy from the progress of the conflict between nationality and slavery! In the former case, the hostile forces conquered each other and entered into friendly and helpful coöperation, while in the latter they have grown into irreconcilable and deadly enemies.

We now enter upon the final phase of that conflict. Our purpose, as before, is to indicate its general and organizing features, and not to write its detailed history.

Was the South conscious of resting her hope of success on the ability of slavery to cope successfully with freedom? In several respects, if she had not been blinded by pride and passion, the inequality of such a struggle was not difficult to see. In the first place, war is, to some extent, a question of numbers. Where people are of the same race and nation, numbers are a decisive factor. Slavery kept population sparse by establishing economical, social, and educational conditions unfavorable to dense white population. We saw the stream of European emigration deflected from the South and turned into the North. Besides, there was a constant movement of non-slaveholders to the free states. In 1850 three times as many native southerners were living in the North as native northerners living in the South. Again, it was impossible to carry all the slave states into secession. The

moral support of Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri was thrown against slavery. Besides, there were thousands of hardy men in the mountains of the seceding states whose sympathy and interest were with the Union. To them slavery had been an unmitigated curse. While thousands of the non-slaveholders went into the Confederate army, yet they readily joined in the cry against the slaveholders' war as being a "rich man's war and a poor man's fight." In all these respects slavery had handicapped itself.

In respect to other resources, the institution had stood in its own way. Slavery could not equip an army. It had very few manufactories for either clothes or guns, or any of the enginery of war. In a financial way, it was far behind the North. Slavery was agricultural, and had rather scorned those great commercial pursuits that furnish ready means of expenditure. The banking capital of the North in 1860 was several times that of the seceding states. Slavery placed its main reliance for credit upon cotton. This did promise much, but freedom had wrought out many products to overbalance this raw product, whose value was lessened by the fact that it had to leave the South before the South could profit by it. An efficient blockade greatly reduced its value.

The South had one real advantage over the North. The slave remained at home and cared for the soldier's family and produced the food supply of the army. This enabled the Confederacy to utilize its white population to an extent impossible at the North. This fact may have furnished,

later in the war, an argument for emancipation. At whatever point you may touch the conditions of successful war, it will be found that slavery had been preparing for its defeat, from Jamestown to Appomattox.

The Revival of Nationality in the North. — The signal for this was the attack upon Fort Sumter. A wave of loyalty swept over the North that broke down almost all differences, and there was but one resolution: a determination to save the Union. The causes of this reaction were several: 1. The North had gone down on its knees to slavery in the winter and spring of 1861, and offered terms that were humiliating. These were, however, rejected. 2. The new administration was far from entering on any aggressive measures, although military preparation was well under way in the South on March 4, 1861. 3. Seizure of national property by seceding states, and the attack upon Fort Sumter, thus making the South the aggressor. 4. The general conviction that many southern leaders were plotting against the nation while holding high office in its service.

The new enthusiasm for the nation was destined to rise and fall. The administration aimed to husband this revival. The greatest obstacle was slavery. The majority of northern people were not abolitionists, and had no desire to interfere with the institution in the states. For this reason the war had for its supreme aim the preservation of the Union. This is the one principle by which Lincoln's conduct of the great struggle may be interpreted at every point. To this end armies were organized and

campaigns planned. It was the supreme consideration in his appointments, political and military. This was the meaning of his border-state policy, and even when emancipation came, this was the test he applied to it. His wisdom in this showed how thoroughly the president understood his constituency.

How the Slavery Question Forced its Way to the Front. — Whatever might be the opinion or prejudice of the North regarding slavery, one thing was certain: slavery was bound to compel consideration. The president might ignore it in his planning, and congress might resolve not to interfere with it; yet it was the great cause of the war, and no great war continues long without some discussion of its cause, especially if the cause continues to be a determining factor.

As soon as the Union armies moved into slave territory, the negroes were inclined to seek freedom within their lines. What shall be done with them? Shall they be freed, returned to slavery, confiscated as property, or let alone? General Butler declared them "contraband of war," other generals returned them to their masters, some, like Frémont, liberated them, while a few put them to service in the army. The president tried to modify the conduct of these generals so as to preserve harmony in the war party.

Congress early passed a resolution that the only purpose of the government in the war was to suppress rebellion and preserve the Union. But events were moving rapidly. The South used the slave in the army. He did the menial

service of the camp, worked on fortifications, and in other respects enabled the southern soldier always to be at the front, thus giving strength to the Confederate army. It was impossible for congress and the administration to ignore this. In August, 1861, such negroes were declared free. There was some opposition from Democrats and border-state men. They feared the example and wanted slavery left entirely alone. This bill simply applied Butler's idea of regarding slaves used in war as contraband.

As the burden of war constantly grew heavier, congress and the majority at the North were less kindly disposed toward slavery. In April, 1862, congress emancipated the slaves in the District of Columbia and compensated their masters. The border-state men again opposed, but were defeated. The anti-slavery spirit gradually rose till in August, 1862, congress confiscated the property of Confederates. This was practically emancipation for the slaves of men in war. While it was thus limited, yet the opposition was vehement both in and out of congress, but could not defeat the measure. The need of some such law to weaken the power of the South was demonstrated by a double sortie from the South; Lee entered Maryland and Bragg, Kentucky, in the late summer and fall of 1862.

While congress was thus striking somewhat boldly at the real cause and continuance of the struggle, President Lincoln was making more cautious movements in the same direction. Early in 1862 he suggested that the government ought to coöperate, by compensation, with any state

which might adopt gradual emancipation. He saw great gain to the Union in this, for if once adopted by any state the hope of that state's joining the Confederacy was gone forever, and in so far the South would be discouraged. The matter of gradual and compensated emancipation was put before the border-state congressmen, but they gave it no support, and he was left, in the progress of war, to face the problem of general and uncompensated emancipation.

The disasters of war were rapidly educating the North up to the point of destroying slavery altogether as the best means of ending the war. Lincoln's great wisdom was in discovering just that point in the march of public sentiment when emancipation would find a good measure of justification. Nothing could move the president from this determination to wait until the country was ready for the great decree. It is an interesting commentary on the progress of history that the people had to be driven by the sore distresses of war before the slave could be freed and the Confederacy be punished. Mourning had to come into thousands of northern homes before the people were willing to save the Union by removing the only cause of its disruption. Millions of money and thousands of men had been sacrificed, and hardly a beginning had been made toward suppressing resistance. McClellan's great campaign against Richmond had failed; Lee had outmaneuvered him and invaded the frightened North. The second battle of Bull Run was fought and lost, Harper's Ferry had surrendered, and the great battle of Antietam had taken place. In the West matters had gone more favor-

ably for the Union. Grant was entering on his successful career and had captured Henry and Donelson, fought the bloody battle of Shiloh, captured Corinth, and was coöperating with the victor of New Orleans for the complete opening of the Mississippi. But during the summer and early September, General Bragg, at the head of an enthusiastic army, marched out of Tennessee into Kentucky and made for Louisville. Buell won the race by a few hours only. The exitement in the North was intense, and the masses began to appreciate more keenly the stupendous problem of saving the Union.

During these first two years of war, the attitude of England and France had been anything but friendly. They began by prematurely acknowledging the insurgents as belligerents. This gave the South a great moral advantage, but impressed the North as an action only too gladly taken. This impression was greatly strengthened by the warlike attitude of Great Britain over the Trent affair. The South very early found encouragement in London in a financial way, and felt that England and France could hardly afford to have their supply of American cotton cut off by war. This seemed to justify the South in expecting some kind of intervention from them. There had been much talk of friendly intervention since the opening of the war, and after McClellan's failure in the Peninsular campaign, this project revived; France, England, and Russia held an unsuccessful correspondence on the subject. The danger of foreign intervention was a constant menace to Union success.

Perhaps the greatest cause of northern irritation toward England, and one which most harmed and helped the parties to the war, was the construction of Confederate privateers in the shipyards of Great Britain. Early in 1862, our minister to England protested against the construction of the vessel afterward known as the *Florida;* and later, against the building of the famous *Alabama.* The conduct of the British government was entirely unsatisfactory, and did much to increase the danger of foreign war.

Besides all these dangers and burdens, the loyal people were bearing, at the time of the proclamation, an immense financial burden that promised to grow constantly heavier. When the great proclamation was issued, the internal revenue tax was a million a day. When we add to this the vast sum raised by tariff duties, the expenditures of states, the contributions of charitable organizations and of private persons, some idea can be formed of the enormous drain upon material resources of the country. All these burdens, and even more, were necessary to bring the American people to consent to the destruction of slavery.

The Significance of the Proclamation of Emancipation. — This is partly revealed in the preceding discussions. Its significance, as discovered in succeeding events, is now to be noted. First, the act completed the growing separation between the administration and certain elements in the North who came to be known as peace men, as they were inclined to sympathize with the Confederacy. From now on, they began to organize to secure peace with-

out regard to the means. Later, they developed a secret organization known in many states as the Sons of Liberty, or Knights of the Golden Circle. Many conservative people, while not sympathizing with these malcontents, yet drew away from the administration and supported the Democratic party in the fall elections of 1862. While the result, so nearly disastrous to the administration,[1] was not entirely due to the proclamation, yet it furnished the "stock" arguments of the campaign. An abolition war, negro equality, negro emigration to the North with its disastrous effects on the white laborer, a government for white men, were some of the catch phrases that made opposition votes rapidly in the border free states. There was just enough in the war policy to give the color of truth to such statements.

A second significance is found in the fact that, while the proclamation divided the North, it unified the South. All classes of southern whites despised the free negro. The poor whites felt now that the negro would likely rise in the scale of importance if the North should win. If a great English statesman could look upon it as an act of vengeance, we can hardly expect the slaveholders to characterize the act with gentler terms. One great cause of exasperation was the plan to employ the slaves as soldiers. This ultimately turned out successful, as many thousand colored troops enlisted. This furnished the Confederate

[1] New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois went Democratic, leaving only a majority of about twenty in the House. New England and the border slave state saved the Union.

authorities with another powerful argument in appealing to their people for a vigorous support of the war.

The proclamation, in a third instance, almost completely removed the danger of foreign intervention, especially by England. The government of England did not dare face its own people, to say nothing of the rest of the world, with a proposition to favor a confederacy of slaveholders against a nation devoted to the destruction of slavery.

In addition, the emancipation of the negro introduced new problems, political and social. When the war is over, what then? The burden of war was so great that men hardly halted to consider the grave questions which were thus forced upon the nation. What shall be the status of the freedmen? From many points of view it was a fearful question, considering their condition.

Finally, the emancipation of the slave was the beginning of the end of the struggle between slavery and nationality. This removes the last important obstacle to our becoming a great nation such as the fathers of the republic little imagined. When the Union is restored, only the effects of slavery will stand in the way of a new national spirit.

Leading Military Events Making Good the Proclamation of Emancipation and the Restoration of the Nation. — The one common content of the events of the war is their bearing on the restoration of the Union. Up to the proclamation, all events tended more or less unconsciously to force slavery into the contest, while many persons strove consciously to eliminate it. After the proclamation all events carry, as a part of their content, the fortunes of

both slavery and the Union. The following events may be regarded as directly affecting this double result, without an understanding of which the result is not intelligible.

1. The campaign for the capture of Vicksburg and the opening of the Mississippi. This occupied a portion of 1862 and the first half of 1863. The result was to finally sever Arkansas and Texas from direct relations with the rest of the Confederacy, in addition to the loss of a large army and vast military stores. The Mississippi states now had direct communication with the Atlantic seaboard.

2. While Grant was capturing Vicksburg, Buell and Rosecrans were driving Bragg out of Kentucky back into the mountains of Tennessee. The leading battles were Perryville and Stone River. Thus driven out of these two great states after so bold a sortie to the North, the moral effect was depressing to the South.

3. Just as Grant was receiving the surrender of Vicksburg, and Rosecrans was pushing Bragg out of Tennessee, General Meade had checked the tide of Confederate invasion at Gettysburg. This was the first great victory in the East since Antietam, while the Confederates could point to Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville. The victory at Gettysburg, while incomplete and short of what the North had a right to expect, had more than the saving of Washington as its result. It demonstrated to the South that the insurgents would receive no more substantial aid from the border states. Not even the provocation of conscription could compel its opponents to join the Confederates. Of course, Lee's army was greatly dispirited,

and desertions rapidly increased. For the time being, these important successes discouraged the efforts of the peace men, both North and South, who tried to secure a cessation of hostilities on terms less than the restoration of the Union.

4. The tide of Union victory was somewhat checked in September, 1863, when Bragg so nearly annihilated Rosecrans at Chickamauga, and cooped up the remnant of his army in Chattanooga. The siege was raised by aid from the victors at Gettysburg and Vicksburg. The Confederate army was defeated in those brilliant and almost unmatched charges up Lookout Mountain and on Missionary Ridge.

5. When General Grant went East, he put General Sherman in command of the great army in the West. By July, 1864, Johnston, after a series of most brilliant retreats, was driven into Atlanta. Hood succeeded him, and had his army defeated. Hood now turned North, and was so disastrously defeated in December by Thomas at Franklin that his army never rallied from the blow. In the meantime, Sherman was making his famous march to the sea. Little opposed, Savannah, Charleston, and other places fell. On his return, Johnston, who had been restored to command, was driven back into North Carolina. This march kept reënforcements from Lee at Richmond, and served to demonstrate the inevitable collapse of the Confederacy.

6. Early in 1864, General Grant was placed in command of all the armies of the Union. With Meade and the army of the Potomac, he began a campaign which ended

only at Appomattox, April, 1865. In this series of battles, Lee's army simply battered itself to pieces. The resources of the Confederate states were exhausted. At no point in the war was the nakedness of slavery so apparent as in these last days. The vast strength of the Union forces, their splendid equipment in arms, food, and clothing, were arguments in favor of freedom and against slavery more powerful than were ever set forth by the logic of statesmen. With an energy hardly paralleled in history, the South had concentrated her forces, political and military, and kept up the movement till her very life was burned out. Her institutions literally collapsed, and there was left only the disorganized heap of ruins.

Other Events from the Proclamation to the Close of the War. — War can never be an end in itself. Hence it must have a non-military motive; it must aim at political or other ends. In a great struggle like the Civil War, the relation between military and political events is always interactive. The following are some of the events which influenced the war itself, and were in turn modified by it.

1. It has already been shown how the financial burdens of the war argued for the abolition of slavery. The financial measures taken after this great event aided in promoting military success, and thus in saving the Union. The establishment of the national banking system was the most important of the later financial measures. It was strongly opposed, but passed early in the spring of 1863, and gave the United States a helpful piece of financial

machinery; and more than all, it gave greater confidence in the financial strength of the country.

2. The critical political event of this part of the struggle was the presidential election of 1864. The Confederacy had much faith in the defeat of Lincoln. This hope rested on several things. One was the probable split in the Republican party. There was much dissatisfaction with the administration's conduct of the war. The abolitionists had not forgiven Lincoln for delaying emancipation till the country was ready for the measure. The radical leaders were impatient with his conservatism on all questions, and especially now over questions preliminary to reconstruction. Some of the more hot-headed issued a manifesto setting forth their opposition. Many disappointed office-seekers joined the opposition which tended to concentrate upon Secretary Chase as the rival candidate for the presidency. Ohio early declared for Lincoln, and Chase withdrew from the field. The malcontents met in convention at Cleveland, May, 1864, and nominated General Frémont. The attitude of the Democrats and the hopelessness of success led him to withdraw. In proportion as the politicians opposed Lincoln, it seemed that the people rallied to his support. From all parts of the Union and from all kinds of bodies came an emphatic demand for his renomination, which took place at Baltimore and on a platform that strongly endorsed his administration, declared against making compromises with the Confederacy, and in favor of an amendment abolishing slavery. The Peace Democrats captured their party in the Chicago convention

and declared the war a failure, called for a convention of states to settle the difficulties between the Confederacy and the Union, and denounced the president for trampling on the Constitution and the rights of the people. This was another way of saying that the Union ought to be saved with slavery. General McClellan was nominated, but in his letter of acceptance he took issue with some parts of the platform. The rapid and successful progress of war made a peace platform and a war candidate seem ridiculously absurd. The election gave Lincoln an overwhelming popular and electoral vote ; all the states voting, except three, went for Lincoln, — a sufficiently emphatic endorsement of his war on slavery.

Digging Slavery up by the Roots. — The proposition of the Confederacy in the last months of the war to employ negroes as soldiers, not only revealed the utter exhaustion of the South, but demonstrated their loss of faith in the possibility of saving the institution. It is interesting and significant that Lee offered to make no stipulations with Grant about slavery when arranging terms at Appomattox. Although slavery was passing away by the logic of events, yet its very roots must be pulled up. This was accomplished by amending the Constitution.

President Lincoln had, by an exercise of "the war power," struck a deadly blow at slavery ; but it was felt that the result, to be a finality, must be stamped upon the Constitution itself. In February, 1865, congress sent the thirteenth amendment to the people. It was ratified and

officially proclaimed by December 18. This amendment put the principle of the anti-slavery clause of the Ordinance of 1787 and the Wilmot Proviso into the Constitution. While most of the states of the Confederacy accepted this amendment, they proceeded to legislate in a way which showed a determination to hold the negroes in a sort of slavery. The worst of these laws pertained to employment, labor contracts, and vagrancy.

When the congress, elected in 1864, met in 1865, the Republican majority was furious over the so-called attempts to nullify the thirteenth amendment, and the apparent encouragement given to those states by President Johnson. The injurious effects of southern legislation upon the negro were partly overcome by the friendly interposition of the Freedmen's Bureau. In June of 1866 congress passed the fourteenth amendment, which embodied the ideas of the "civil rights" bill and provided penalties for limiting the suffrage of any class of citizens. This was not ratified till July, 1868. In the next year the final amendment growing out of the Civil War passed congress and went to the states for their approval. This was proclaimed in March, 1870, and denied to the United States and to the states the power to refuse suffrage to any one "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Thus was completed, by constitutional amendment, the process by which the nation annihilated its greatest enemy, and the United States now began that career of unrivaled national prosperity on which it might have entered in 1840 had not slavery blocked the way.

While many of the results of the struggle of nationality and slavery were negative, yet, in general, a new national consciousness was born in this life-and-death struggle which prepared the nation to enter with greater vigor upon its new career. What this new movement is, and what its dominant and controlling principle is, does not belong to the present discussion to determine, but that there is a new organizing principle controlling its events, all the preceding discussions lead us to believe; also that its discovery and application in the teaching of the new period after 1870 is of vital importance, pedagogical as well as historical.

THE ELEMENTARY PHASES OF HISTORY TEACHING.

THE SENSE PHASE OF HISTORY.

The General Problem.

Logical and Psychological Method. — That which is logically first in a subject comes last into the possession of the unfolding mind, and that which comes psychologically first to the growing mental powers stands logically last in the subject. But every fact that occupies the line between these two mental points looks back to that which precedes as means, and forward to that which follows as end. This is the justification for the arrangement of the subject-matter in this book. No one can intelligently determine what the method of history work should be without first discovering the logical relations in the subject-matter itself. The subject in its scientific form stands as the goal toward which every lesson must point, no matter where the material is found along the line between these two points. It is in this spirit that the lower phases of history study are to be considered. Not that the lower

forms have no value in themselves, but rather that their relations to the higher phases of the study constitute their greater pedagogical significance.

However, we must now take into account a guiding fact not before considered, namely, the gradual unfolding of the powers of the immature mind. We start now at the other end of the line of mental life and work forward toward the ideal of mind and subject set forth in the preceding discussions. The mind's degree of strength and the characteristics which mark its various stages of growth constitute a new and determining principle in our problem. The organized body of knowledge with which we have been busy must yield to this principle. Logical relations must give way to psychological conditions. The child with its intellectual and moral possibilities passing over into actualities is the all-controlling factor in primary method. This is the greatest adjusting principle in all primary teaching.

If we approach the question from the side of mind, we find the law of dependence holding between its forms of activity. The senses furnish material for the imagination, and both supply matter for the understanding, and the latter for the reason. The phase of history already discussed pertains to those attributes, relations, and laws furnished mainly by the understanding and reason. From the point of view of mind, therefore, we have yet to discuss the material of history in its relation to these lower forms of mental life, — the senses and the imagination. This is really another double problem. Here we are

again to show how the material of history is transformed by, and also transforms, the lower mental activities.

Nature and Purpose of Sense History. — Does history have a Sense phase? Let us see. History deals with the thought and feeling of a people. A people's thought and feeling are expressed in outward acts. These acts are sensuous and physical; they can be seen, heard, and felt. But it may be said that while the events of history were objects of observation to persons who lived when and where they occurred, they can never be present to the senses again. It is true that, for the most part, the field of historical happenings is beyond the reach of the senses. It is just as true, also, that the child, up to the time he reaches school, has been observing and participating in the acts of men, — has been experiencing history. While the acts observed in this period of the child's life are not the individual acts he will study in after days, yet so great is the transforming power of the imagination that it can take the deeds of man presented to the senses and build from them pictures of the deeds of all people of all times. Now, the events that thus occur in the presence of the pupil's senses belong in the domain of all the institutions of human society. He is born into and remains a member of the family. He early learns the connection between occupations and his supply of food and clothing. At six he enters school, and, it is quite likely, before this he has been to Sunday school and church. If he is an average boy, long ere this he has taken an active personal interest in a political campaign. There thus seems to be a pretty

wide field here which the pupil has already entered. Why should not this work, spontaneously begun, be taken up and carried further by the teacher? It would seem that a fuller and a more systematic study could be commenced when the pupil first enters school. It might be well to let this spontaneous process go on for two or three years longer, till the class has covered all Sense work in geography except that which relates to man. Such an arrangement would permit the teacher to combine this last part of Sense geography with Sense history. The two subjects, in material and point of view, are practically the same.

In order that we may accomplish definite results, the end toward which we work must be clearly in mind. A definite purpose will, also, direct in the selection of the material for work. The answer may be given in terms of discipline and of knowledge. 1. On the side of discipline: (*a*) the primary object is to confer the habit of judging men's thoughts and feelings through their acts; (*b*) a secondary end is to give the mind the habit of careful observation — the habit of finding truth in objects present to the senses. 2. On the side of knowledge: (*a*) the primary object is to give the mind material out of which the imagination may construct pictures of historical events; (*b*) the secondary purpose, or rather result, is to give a more thorough knowledge of local institutions. The primary end on the side of discipline is peculiar to history. No other subject, in all its phases, puts the mind to the test of finding man's head and heart in his acts. This is a power conferred by the study of history at every point. It should not be lost sight

of in the Sense phase; for it seems very appropriate that when the mind begins to struggle with this problem, its material should be in its very presence and be sensuous and simple. A result, rather than a purpose, will be to give the mind the habit of studying objects that appeal to the sense. This is not peculiar to this kind of history work, but is rather a mental result to which many subjects contribute. The primary end aimed at on the side of knowledge in this phase of the work grows out of the relation between the Sense and the Representative phases of mental life. Because of the close dependence between them, it is right to say that Sense history has its highest significance in the fact that it gives the mind the material that makes possible the next stage of the work, — a stage in which the mind is busy in constructing pictures of the past. Most of the events of history are of this kind, — Representative. Their mastery by the higher powers of the mind largely depends on the clearness and fullness with which the imagination can picture them. Now, the skill of the imagination partly depends on the material furnished the mind through the senses. It seems right, therefore, to say that the primary aim here is to prepare for the second phase of history study. Since the events dealt with in Representative history must reach the mind through the language of books or of teachers, it is right to say that this first phase of work prepares the mind to put meaning into the language, by means of which events are described to the imagination. It is no unusual thing for the pupil not to be able to put content into the words of the history text.

He feels that a recitation must be made, and his only resource is to commit the language of the lesson. In such cases the book fails to arouse the pupil's imagination, because the content of the book is foreign to any of his previous experiences. In other words, the pupil has not been properly prepared for the ideas and vocabulary of the history text. From this point of view, we seem justified in holding that the primary purpose in Sense history is to prepare the mind for the second phase of the study. This makes it clear that a knowledge of local institutions is a result, rather an end; or it may be regarded as a means to the primary end. This signifies that local institutions are to be studied only in so far as they prepare material for the imagination. The knowledge of affairs could hardly be the primary aim in this kind of work on account of the degree of mental strength.

The Material for Sense History. — The matter presented is intended to be merely suggestive — to indicate the lines of work which this phase of history opens up to the teacher. This work presupposes two things: 1. That the pupil has been in school two or three years and has finished the Sense phase of geography, except that part dealing with man and his institutions. 2. That the teacher sees the intimate connection between Sense political geography and Sense history.

In opening up a new field of study to the immature mind, the point of beginning is a question of some importance. If the subject is a difficult one, the part taken first is determined by the principle that the mind deals most

easily with material familiar to it through frequent and intimate experience. With which institution should the child begin his observation? In obedience to the principle stated we must find that institution in which the acts of man fall easiest within the limits of the child's powers, and whose customs and ideas have entered most fully into his everyday life. The institution that has furnished him the widest range of concrete and sensuous experience must furnish the material for the first series of lessons.

These conditions seem to be most fully met by the family. Into this institution the pupil was born eight or nine years ago. He has differentiated himself from the rest of his young friends by recognizing himself as a member of a certain family, and has put them into groups on the basis of family connections. His wants and desires have been supplied by the family, and around it and its members his affections have twined themselves. These facts, and many more akin to them, seem to point to the family as the form of institutional life with which the work may most easily and profitably begin. The question now is what the family furnishes for his observation that will aid in the study of social life of a past age — will aid in picturing their life of customs and deeds, and in making inferences from these as to their thought and feeling. The following topics point the way toward the answer: —

1. The relationship between parents and children. The main ideas here are the parents as lawgivers and the children as obedient subjects. The pupil can see himself under a rule of action common to each member of his related

group, and must see some of the results that attend obedience and disobedience. These are ideas that he will meet many times, and in Bible history he will be called on to construct a system of government built out of the family tie. Whenever the family is met, he should picture the home and its relationships.

2. Relation of the family to food, clothing, and shelter. This will bring the pupil to study a subject that has touched him very intimately. The common duties that he has to perform, as a member of the family, can be traced so that he will see their relation to his physical wants. The lesson of mutual dependence can also be learned, — how the physical and social good of each is linked to that of the whole. The position of each member of the family as to ownership in property, and the law and custom of his community bearing on the distribution of the property among children, furnish interesting and valuable topics.

3. Relationship between families. This subject opens the whole field of observable social life. The study of customs — particularly those pastimes and games in which people engage for pleasure — will be an inviting field to the young pupil; and, all unconsciously, he will lay up a vast fund of material out of which he will construct the social life of the past, particularly that part of it pertaining to the boys and girls of the olden time.

Intimately connected with the family is the industrial life of the community. We have seen that the pupil has had a wide range of experience relating to food and clothing, — the most tangible results of industry. He has felt

his dependence upon them in the study of the family; hence it seems very easy to make the transition from the study of social, to the study of industrial, life. This new field opens a wide range of simple observable facts. Here are a few lines that may be worked out: —

1. The kinds of occupations and their relation to one another. The lesson of mutual dependence can be taught here again, but on a much wider scale than was illustrated in the family.

2. Effect of different kinds of occupations on the habits and customs of the people.

3. The protection of property by law. From the pupil's own observation, a study must be made of the process by which this is done. This would include the arrest and temporary imprisonment of the accused, summoning witnesses, the trial, and the punishment. In dealing with a concrete case, in which trial and punishment follow as a means to protect property, a good opportunity is offered to judge of the thought and feeling of men as expressed in their acts. What did the owner of the property and his neighbors do when the theft occurred? Why? The answer must come in terms of their thoughts and feelings. How does the accused man feel, and what does he think? How do you know? Why should he be tried, and what is the purpose of fining and imprisoning him? The pupil may not be able to penetrate and fully interpret all these acts; but this is so vital an act of mind in all historical investigation that the pupil cannot begin too soon, and push it as far as his strength will allow.

The study of the school at first hand, so as to get historical material, is more difficult — less concrete — than in the institutions already examined: 1. Something of the intention of his parents in sending him to school may be brought out, — its industrial significance, perhaps; but certainly nothing of its higher significance can be inferred by him. 2. The idea of the free character of the school must be presented to him, with as much of its significance as he can master. 3. The different grades of schools and their wide distribution will suggest what an ambitious person may do. 4. How the teacher is selected and paid, and the pupil's relation to him in the school.

The institution we call the church is, in most of its phases, beyond the child's power. But even here something may be done by observation and study: 1. The kinds of religious denominations and their feeling toward one another. In a general way, the pupil may see that the people separate into sects because of a difference in thoughts. 2. The purpose of the church and Sunday school determined from the acts they do. 3. The social customs connected with the church.

There is another very important and still more fruitful field for Sense work in history, — the political. The following points may be helpful in suggesting where material in this field may be found: —

1. Every neighborhood furnishes the pupil examples of men set apart by some process to perform the duties of local government. The mode of selection, the purpose, and duties of such officers should be brought under the pupil's observation.

2. If he lives in town or city, there is still greater opportunity for Sense study; the policeman in uniform, the mayor, the assessor, the men who work in the streets, — each of these calls for attention and has its own lesson.

3. Political events, especially those connected with state and national campaigns, furnish abundant and valuable material for the end we have in view. Besides, by the concrete and sensuous character of the events, they have moved his feelings very intensely — much more so than the events in the other phases of life. The boy, and the girl too, for that matter, has not lived very long until his sympathies have been deeply enlisted in a political campaign. The chances are that long before ten years of age he has participated in more than one political demonstration. Whatever may be said about the desirability of a child participating so early in political prejudices, it is certainly true that it gives him an abundant supply of material to aid in putting content into events of a kindred nature which he will soon be dealing with — events that can only appear to him in the realm of imagination. All the glitter and show, pomp and parade, noise and music of a campaign are not lost on a boy. They have a value for him far beyond the immediate present. Think of the gorgeous picture that flashes before his senses and impresses itself upon his memory: brass bands, large numbers of great decorated wagons drawn by spans of spirited horses, and filled with grace and beauty, great men riding in state, — governors, senators, statesmen, and orators, — uniformed ranks with stately tread, long lines of brilliant torches, the flash and flare of

fireworks, the roar of cannon, the billows of human huzzas, triumphal arches, and banners with inscriptions!

Two boys — one has never seen this picture or its like, while the other has been a part of it; which of them can picture most fully and vividly a Roman triumph, the celebration of a king's coronation, the greeting that Columbus received on his first return to Spain, the arrival of the royal governor in Virginia, the processions that paid honor to Washington as he passed through the land, the grand review in Washington at the close of the Civil War? There can be but one answer. Again, this observation of a political demonstration on the part of the pupil gives the teacher a rare opportunity to cultivate the historic judgment. What were his feelings? Why did he participate in the parade? What was the purpose of the other people in taking part, and what was their feeling? Prove the answer. How did the persons who staid at home and refused to join the demonstration feel? Prove it. By questions, the pupil may be led to analyze the outside show and the inner significance of a political demonstration.

The interest in local institutions which should take root in this phase of the work ought to grow throughout life. A permanent and abiding interest in the home community is closely akin to intelligent patriotism, and may be secured by means of a line of work dealing with some phase of local institutional life and extending over the entire period of school work. At each step the facts studied must be present to the pupil through personal observation, if possible, and in no case should they consist of a bare enumer-

ation of certain local dignitaries by means of an official terminology. The concrete institutional process is what the pupil should see, and, as far as possible, understand. In the beginnings of such observation, more of the concrete process will be seen and less of its meaning understood, but the growth of power over the latter will come with continued effort and wider observation.

Such work not only finds its justification in its bearing on the affairs of the community, but also in the fact that it furnishes a basis in actual experience for the proper understanding of all history. As this work grows, the teacher will observe an increasing capacity and desire on the part of the pupil to make the connection between the historical products of his own community and state, and the historical process which he is tracing in the events of the past. The presence of such a power and inclination should be hailed with delight on the part of the teacher and should be properly stimulated by increased opportunities. Such work has a sort of double value: it lifts the institutional facts of the community up to their place in the general historical process and at the same time brings the apparently remote historical movement down to the present, and roots it among the concrete life of which the pupil is a part. For every discovery thus made the pupil will become a better citizen and a better student of history. There is no time-limit to this process of making local institutions, and the historical processes of institutions contribute to the understanding of each other. It is not desirable to give equal attention to both phases, but

complete separation at any time in the study of American history makes the best results impossible.

The conclusion is that first-hand experience with institutions in the concrete, all along the line of historical study, will not only enrich the life of the coming citizen, but will add many-fold to the pupil's and student's power over the great historical past.

THE REPRESENTATIVE PHASE OF HISTORY.

The General Problem.

Nature and Immediate Purpose. — Any attempt to draw sharp lines of separation between the phases of history based on the phases of mental activity will result in harm These phases are not rigidly distinct. They transfuse — each is found in the others and is necessary to their highest form. The Representative phase of history looks two ways, — back to Sense material, and forward to Reflective work. We know that one purpose of Sense history is to furnish the memory an abundance of rich material upon which the imagination can draw in the process of creating in pictured form the history of our country. While it is true that in the first phase of the work the mind is mainly absorbed in sensuous events which it mainly uses in the second, yet as the pupils go through life the senses are open and the material is used at every stage. So, too, the judgment, in some of its forms, is present in the first two stages of the work as well as predominant in the third.

The immediate purpose of the Representative phase of history is to give the mind that peculiar form of activity which its stage of growth calls for. As the mind passes from immaturity to maturity, it enters a phase of activity in which Representation seems to be very active. At this

period the mind delights in image-making — takes more interest in this form of exercise than in any other, and more interest now than it will at any other time in its development. It ought, therefore, to be given all the opportunity it craves for this form of exercise. In history this may be done by causing the mind to transform into pictures of historical events the material it gathered in Sense history. To cultivate — stimulate and strengthen — the imagination is the immediate intellectual end to be held in view in this second stage of the work.

There is, as there must be in all nature, a beautiful harmony between this form of mental activity and a peculiar form of historical phenomena. There is not only a phase of mind activity that we may designate as the Representative, but there is a form of historical material that fits into this side of the mind's life and is adapted to stimulate it. We have seen all along the way that history has to deal with two sets of parallel phenomena, an inner and an outer, — ideas and events. The latter is sensuous and external, and can be reproduced in imagination with all the attributes that characterized it in its sensuous form — just as it appeared to the eyes and ears of the men who witnessed it. So true is the imagination to the senses, if it has an opportunity, that one may become so absorbed in the picture it paints as to feel for a moment that he stands in the very presence of the scenes recounted — it may be, as a participant in them. When we reflect upon the fact that every great wave of human thought and feeling has expressed itself in external phenomena that may thus be

vividly reproduced by the imagination, it becomes evident that this phase of historical knowledge must play an important part in the study of any portion of this subject; and it may well become our immediate purpose on the side of knowledge to give the imagination possession of this form of historical material.

This phase of the study has been called, not inappropriately, the Story side of history. The name is significant because it emphasizes that which charms us most in the real story, — the movement of a stream of pictures which the story sets going in our imagination. These charm us by the ease with which they come and go, and by the richness and variety they present. The characters are concrete — they are given a sensuous setting. This is not unlike what happens in the Representative or Story side of history; the pupil becomes consciously interested in the acts and actors that history reproduces, as it were, before his very eyes. It is this side of the objects presented that interests and absorbs him rather than the possible relations which may be revealed by the judgment under the direction of the teacher.

The conclusion must not be drawn that imagination is the only form of mental activity in this kind of work. This would be far from the truth. The judgment is always present, even when the imagination is at its best. Neither one excludes the other, but they are mutually helpful. The historical form of the judgment — in which it infers thought and feeling from acts — is really dependent upon the imagination for its material. Thought and

feeling cannot be inferred unless the imagination calls the deeds back to life again. In its turn the work of the judgment reacts upon the pictured scene and not only makes it more vivid, but more permanent as well. Let us call up the picture of the battle of Bunker Hill at the close of the second retreat. How different is the scene inside and outside of the breastworks! As the imagination pictures the hill-slope strewn with British dead and wounded, and the Americans comparatively unhurt behind their rude fort, the judgment finds an explanation in the relation which the fort bears to the parties in conflict. What is the effect on the picture of the judgment passing from fort to British and from fort to Americans as it searches for the explanation? There can be but one result, — a stronger and more lasting picture of the scene. The parts of the picture are no more the simple, independent parts they were when the imagination first began to light up the scene, but now they are tied together forever by the relation of contrasted results due to the same cause. It seems to me that it will always be an aid to the imagination for the judgment to go rumaging among the parts of its pictures to find relations.

If the above be true, this question may be raised: Why not make the search for these relations by the judgment the immediate purpose, on the side of knowledge, for which the second phase of history is studied? Three reasons point rather to the immediate purpose as stated above: 1. The mind at this stage makes pictures more easily than it searches for relations. 2. The picture work is more

interesting and absorbs attention and effort more easily. 3. This phase of historical material must come into the mind's possession as the basis for higher work. It seems desirable, therefore, that picture-making should characterize the work at some time. If it is not done in this period of the child's life, it will stand in his way when the teacher is turning the emphasis of conscious effort toward the reflective side of the work; it will then mean that the pupil must do the work that could have been better done at an earlier date — that he must now expend a portion of his energy in filling out the picture side of events instead of concentrating all his power on the discovery of relations. Many illustrations of the disadvantage such a pupil must labor under may be given, but the case is so plain that it hardly needs more than a statement to be accepted.

The Remote Purpose. — The above point brings us face to face with the question of the remote ends to be gained by the Representative phase of history work. Of course, the mind cannot rest with this kind of work and attain either the greatest degree of strength or the highest form of knowledge the subject is capable of yielding. If the pupil is conscious of an end in this work, it is very likely that he thinks only of the immediate end on the side of knowledge. He is not conscious of a remote end. What if the teacher is in the same predicament? In order that the pupil may do the picture-making side of his work well, the teacher must be living under the inspiration that comes from an end that is outside of and beyond the little piece of work that she may be laboring upon. There is little

hope for pupil or teacher if the latter does not see in this phase of work the steps on which the pupil is to climb to higher realms. The remote end must always control the immediate, for the latter is means to the former. How shall the means be handled? How shall the picture-making phase of work be carried on, — in what spirit, along what lines, and to what extent in any line? Now these questions cannot be answered unless the teacher sees how this work is to issue in power to gain more and higher knowledge — unless the remote end is constantly before the mind as the guiding light.

In discussing the remote ends to be reached by this kind of history teaching, it is hardly necessary to distinguish between discipline and knowledge. Both the kind of mental exercise and the form of knowledge to be reached will perhaps serve equally well as remote ends to guide one in leading the pupil so that he gets the best discipline in this phase of the work, and at the same time lays the best foundation for the new work.[1]

The Ethical Purpose. — It will be observed that the ends discussed above relate to the intellectual side of this phase of the work. Ethical or moral results in teaching are ends in themselves and can hardly be discriminated as immediate and remote; at least they need not be so differentiated for this discussion. The formation of a noble

[1] It is quite possible that the distinction between teaching for discipline and teaching for knowledge is a mechanical one, and that the teaching for highest discipline is precisely the teaching that gives the highest knowledge.

character is the primary aim of teaching. In respect to the development of the ethical side of such a character, history, from the nature of its material, lends itself to such an end more readily and more efficiently than many other subjects. This appears from the discussion relating to the ethical value of interpretation, and will be further reënforced by the investigation into the material appropriate for Representative history. Indeed, the ethical element is present, in some degree, in every stage of history work, and must be taken into consideration. Wherever history reveals a conflict between individual men, between parties of men, between nations, or, where the view is profound enough, between ideas themselves, there will appear the ethical element and there will exist the opportunity to add fresh stimulus to the ethical nature of pupil or student.

Although the intellectual and ethical purposes of this phase of work have been separated for purposes of discussion, it must not be inferred that the elements of character to which they correspond are so separated. Character is so completely a unit that it is pedagogically dangerous to isolate its elements even in thought. They are essential and coöperating parts in the organic process called life or character. Hence the danger of setting up one of these elements as the supreme end in the teaching of any phase of history work.

Material for Representative History.

The Starting-point. — What the pupil may accomplish in this phase of the work is partly determined by the amount of his first-hand experience with institutions in the concrete and by the characteristics of his mental life at this stage. The material to be selected and the way in which it is to be handled are controlled, in addition to the above considerations, by the ends to be held in view. It will be taken for granted that the pupil, in the following discussions, begins this work at eight or ten years of age and has had such an experience with the life of the community as was indicated in the preceding stage. With these principles in mind we may inquire how the pupil should be led from the sensible present back into the pictured past in order that he may begin properly the return journey. How far back shall we go, — back a generation or two, back to colonial days, back to the European homes of the early colonists, or back to the heroes of Greece and Rome ?

The remote purpose of Representative history probably points to colonial life as the proper beginning-point. This purpose demands that the selection of material and its method of treatment shall prepare for the next higher phase of work. In order to make the best preparation for work in which the powers of the understanding become the dominant form of activity, the memory and imagination must first come into possession of the picturable side of those events and movements which furnish the material

for this higher study. When a mind grapples with the content of those events and movements whose story is already mastered, how great the advantage over the one which must master story and content at the same time! It may be urged that this remote end calls for pictures of the colonists in their European homes. There are two considerations against this: European life is not an end in the study of American history, and if studied, it is for the light it throws upon colonial life; again, the European life of the colonist was vastly more complex than his life in America, and too far removed, as a type, from what was planted in America and from the institutional life which has fallen under the pupil's observation.

These considerations in favor of beginning with colonial history as against a related phase of European history are to be urged with added force against making Grecian and Roman story the beginning-point in history for American children. One may admit the argument drawn from the culture-epoch theory, and yet not be compelled to admit it as decisive of the case, since the same elements of life existed to a large extent in the American colonial period. Perhaps this life was not so entirely naïve as among the ancients, and yet it was so truly heroic and so adventurous that it only needs the hand of a master to furnish American children with all those elements of culture which are supposed to be derived from the stories of Greece and Rome. When we consider, in addition, that this old life, with all its simplicity, is so far removed from us in time, spirit, and external setting, that it is impossible for the

pupil to obtain a correct picture of it, we are compelled to surrender it as a beginning-point for primary history, to say nothing of its not furnishing material for the next phase of American history.

Lines of Transition from the Present into the Past. — If colonial life is accepted as the starting-point of the new phase of work, we may now turn back and ask how the transition is to be made easy in passing from the work of sense to this new field of the imagination. Are there means by which the transfer of attention and interest may be easily and effectively made? Can the mind of the pupil be given a new motive that will carry him over into the new field? The teacher must be able to answer these questions in the affirmative, for it is of vital consequence to the pupil at least to feel that there is some connection between the facts studied that makes it appropriate to proceed in a given order. Disastrous results come to him from jumping around here and there without reason or motive being apparent — disastrous to the pupil's habit of thought and to a true idea of the nature of history. The line of transition, therefore, must connect at one end with the pupil's experience, and at the other with the new field of work.

Pupils who live in the "thirteen colonies" enjoy a great advantage in finding an easy and natural transition from the present to colonial times. This link of connection is furnished by the external evidences of the struggle for independence. These evidences may consist of remains of forts, lines marking battlefields, houses of celebrated

characters, halls where assemblies were held, or monuments commemorating famous men and events. Here we have a happy combination of Sense and Representative history. The remains themselves are sensuous, while the men and events associated are present only in memory and imagination. How much more real are the men and events *felt* to be when the senses join hands with the imagination in their representation! Local history, when it is possible, would seem to furnish the most natural and easiest transition for the young feeling their way back into the past.

Even in those communities where historical remains are wanting, the pupil has hardly reached this age without having had his curiosity excited by some hint or story to the effect that the place where he now resides has not always been the abode of his kinsmen or of the people of the same race. He has, no doubt, heard stories and may have seen evidences of the existence of the red man in the place where now are farms, villages, or cities. He perhaps knows that the face of the country, in that distant time, was uncultivated and likely covered with dense forests. Then again, he has a general idea that his parents, or more likely his grandparents, came from the eastward, and perhaps that there has been a general movement of the white people from the East toward the West. If this material is not at hand through experience and contact with people and things, then the teacher must furnish it through familiar conversation, or lead him to search at home and among friends for such evidence as may be at hand to indicate the presence here of another race and

the absence of the white one, and of the procession of the latter from the Atlantic toward the West.

A Background for Colonial Life. — This should contain a general notion of the country as covered by great forests filled with animal life, such as the first settlers found here, and on which the Indians partly subsisted. The natives themselves will form an important part of this background, — their appearance, modes of life, and other ideas and customs. It is not meant to suggest any detailed study of the Indians, as the subject might well tempt one to do with pupils at this age, for they do not form an essential and permanent feature of our historical life. The aim here is to create a background so the pupil can see step by step the progress of the whites to the westward, and at the same time will have in mind some conditions that will make clear the conflicts between the white and red men, and why the latter were gradually driven westward.

The Colony and the Institution with which to Begin. — With this part of the story done, the teacher is confronted with another question : Where shall the account of the life of the colonies begin, and how shall the work be distributed ? Let us look at the last question first. The people who came to America were not entirely homogeneous in institutional life; in fact, we may find four pretty distinct types, — English, Dutch, French, and Spanish. Somewhere in this phase lessons must be given on the last three types, but not at the beginning, for they are too foreign — too far removed from the

child's experience to serve as a beginning-place. Among the thirteen colonies we have four pretty well-marked classes, — the Puritan of New England, the planter and slaveholder of the South, the Pennsylvania Quaker, and the Dutchman of New York. Any picture of colonial life without the shadings and variety of at least these four forms would be very incomplete. In excluding the French and Spanish from the beginnings of this phase of the work, the first question has been narrowed to this: Which phase of colonial life selected offers the best conditions for a beginning-point? The answer lies, perhaps, between the New England and southern life. Since the Quakers came to America so much later than the others, it would seem awkward to begin with them, and the Dutch are farthest removed. As between the remaining groups the difference in time is so small as to constitute no argument in favor of the southern group, the choice must fall on New England, at least for northern pupils, for the reason that the contrast between the observation and experience of the pupils and the life of New England is not so wide as in the case of the other colonies.

We now have another question to clear up: Which phase of New England history shall furnish material for the first round of Representative work? Shall we follow the order of the leading events, beginning with the arrival of the *Mayflower*, and move on down toward the Revolution, or shall we go to the home life of this simple, earnest folk and get as close as possible to their everyday experience, and then follow out each institution in order of

difficulty? The Sense work points to the latter line as most appropriate at this stage of the pupil's knowledge and strength. The emphasis which he placed on the social side of the Sense work gave him material out of which he can more easily construct the same form of life among the peoples of the past. It ought to be added, however, that at a later stage of the Representative phase, the leading events of New England's history should be taken up and followed out in order of occurrence, for the immediate purpose of filling the imagination with full, vivid pictures of them. The nature of these events — Indian wars, disputes about claims, banishment of Roger Williams, establishment of representative government, New England union, persecution of the Quakers — removed them much farther from the pupil's experience than the simpler facts of family and industrial life. Besides, there is no particular gain to the pupil in following the order of events unless he can catch the meaning of the order.

Forms in which Representative Material may be Presented.

Here is another question: In what form shall the work be presented to the pupil? Shall it be given in the ordinary narrative-descriptive form, modified to suit his capacity, or shall this beginning work be woven into the form of a story? There are really three ways of getting this Representative material before him: 1. The story that centers around an ideal person. 2. The story whose

center is a real historical personage. 3. The story that is built about events and institutions as the center.

The Story of the Ideal Historical Person. — The choice between these is first between the first two and the last. The young are more easily interested in persons than in events and institutional customs. The marshaling of historical facts around an interesting personage — ideal or real — gives them a coloring and depth of interest that can be supplied in no other way. These facts become invested with a portion of the interest and the attributes of life that attach to the person whose career and experiences are being followed. But events and persons in general do not find the same response from the primary pupil. They may find some, but these do not, in the nature of things, come so near the child's experience gathered from his environment. So that it would seem to be best, ordinarily, to begin with the story. Perhaps there is a choice between the two classes of stories. Let us see by trying the same test, — the child's experience. Which comes nearer this, the ideal or the real historical person? Perhaps this depends upon their nature. It is not clear that an ideal historical personage who thinks and acts like mature men and women would have much advantage over the real characters in history. But suppose the hero or heroine was a boy or girl whose plane of thought and living was not much beyond that of the pupil. It seems quite clear that such an ideal historical character might be the center of a story that would stand much nearer the pupil than any story the teacher could build

around the full-grown man or woman of history. This does not mean that no historical facts beyond the grade of the pupil's observation may be gathered around the historical boy or girl. For the opposite can be and has been done in the case of *Ten Boys on the Road from Long Ago to Now.* The truth is that the real child takes an interest in things far beyond his ability to understand their connections. By being interested in adult people he becomes interested in the doings of adult people. For this reason the historical story whose center is an ideal boy or girl may introduce facts and events pertaining to the various customs and institutions of human society, providing these are associated with persons in whom the ideal boy or girl has a natural interest. In the little work alluded to above, we see it illustrated in the case of each of the ten characters. It is plain in the case of the Aryan boy when he participates in the rude worship of his family or follows the migrations of his kindred down into the plains of the Indus. Again, what real child will not sympathize with the ideal lad, Ezekiel, when he calls out to his mother from the anguish of his little heart, as he sees his father dragged to jail: "How shall we get father back again?" It even makes a different impression upon the adult mind, because of the personal interest in Ezekiel, than would the account in the ordinary text of the persecution of the Puritans in the time of James I. Here are great questions brought down to the child's own level without losing entirely their real historical significance. When Ezekiel's father comes back from the harsh treat-

ment of the prison, what need is there to search for other causes of the Puritan migration to New England? In other words, great facts of history may be made to fasten themselves into the minds and hearts of our pupils, because these facts are seen to have fastened themselves into the hearts and thoughts of boys and girls in whom the pupils have an interest. This is based on a universal law of human life, — that life begets life; sympathy calls forth sympathy; conditions and experiences not too foreign call from the human heart the same thoughts and feelings that are experienced by the parties who live under the conditions and undergo the experiences. This principle is the explanation of much of the success or failure of the history work in primary and secondary schools.

What is contended for in this phase of Representative history is a presentation that parallels such geographical stories as the *Seven Little Sisters, Each and All,* and *Little Folks of the Other Lands.* Some very meritorious beginnings have been made in other fields of history, as may be seen with reference to the list of books bearing on this phase of the work; but very few writers have taken advantage of the rich field of colonial life, for the benefit of American boys and girls. There is hardly lacking a single element to make such a story absorbingly interesting to primary pupils. Such an account would reveal how boys and girls lived in that far-off time: what they ate and by what means it was prepared at its various stages, and from whence it was obtained; what sort of clothing for the

body and the covering for the feet, and the instruments and methods by which each was prepared; what sort of homes, how built and furnished; what the sons and daughters of that time did to help on the family life; what their pastimes and pleasures were; their opportunities for study and the character of the books they read or heard read; how these young friends participated in the affairs of the other institutions or took an interest in those who did; a thousand absorbing features could be discovered in colonial history, by the skillful story-teller, to lend their charms to such a book or to such a story told at first hand to the pupils by the teacher. It must not be inferred that because books dealing with this sort of material are scarce that the work may not go on. In fact, there are hundreds of teachers who can present the material in an oral form so as to seem much more real and excite more interest than if presented in a story read. In the first place, it must lose something in being read — being given second hand. In the second place, there is a naturalness and directness in the oral story that is missing in the one read. Besides, many more teachers can tell a story fairly well than believe they can. The greatest difficulty is overcome when the right sort of material is collected and the nature and purpose of the work is appreciated.

It has already been stated that American colonial history furnishes some very appropriate material for this work. What more unique and interesting characters could be woven into an historical story than a Puritan boy and girl? The wealth of incident here would be the only serious

drawback. The hard struggle of the first families against climate and hunger; how a few families formed a town which grew by additions; how the church and the school occupied much of the children's time; what their experiences were with the Indians; how they felt and acted toward them, and what an Indian war meant; how these Puritan families in the town got their living; what pastimes were regarded as innocent and what as injurious; how the little town dealt with offenders against law and custom; the high respect and esteem with which all held the minister of the village; the Puritan boy must go with his father and his neighbors to the fishing-grounds and see how this important supply of food is obtained and witness the entire process by which it is prepared for use and for the market, and then visit with the merchant ships the lands where the fish are exchanged for other products and for ready money. Such a story might very appropriately cover the period from 1630 to 1660 and be succeeded by another covering the Quaker agitation, the trouble with Andros, and the witchcraft delusion, and perhaps some scenes from King William's war. In the first half of the eighteenth century we must have a story that gathers around it the great struggle between the English and the French for possession of the fur-trade and the fishing-ground along the Atlantic. Into this could be woven the growth of smuggling and piracy, and how finally the colonists carried on smuggling in the face of such laws as the Sugar Act, and how many of them built up vast industries on this illicit trade.

In deep and striking contrast with the stories of New England life, as seen through youthful eyes, would stand the experience of a planter's son and daughter. What differences of environment; life on a plantation instead of in a town; few associates instead of the society of many; private instruction instead of the schools, and then a long journey to college or a trip abroad for the son; the presence of negro slaves; now the pupil may follow his hero to the dock and see the newly arrived slaver and her cargo; he may hear the bargaining between owner and master; and finally may watch the landing of the dusky freight in which his hero is to have a personal interest; he may visit the quarters and see how they are fed and clothed; follow them in the performance of their duties in the field or around the house; and thus catch an insight into the spirit with which they perform their allotted task; he may be permitted to hear the crack of the slave-driver's whip. No doubt the young planter will reveal in his conduct the pride of his family in their ancestors, their broad acres, and the large drove of negroes; no doubt he will also reveal his feeling of social superiority over the children of the overseer and the non-slaveholder. What materials for an absorbing story — nothing like it in the rest of America!

We must not forget the boy with the broad-brimmed hat and drab clothes who came over with William Penn and witnessed the great treaty. There is still another boy, living up on the Hudson, whose name is Knickerbocker; he founded the Empire state, and had many interesting experiences very different from our other boys. Of course there

is no reason why this form of the story should end with the colonial period. Indeed, the periods of history that follow furnish even more abundant material than the colonial — especially of military heroes.

We have outlined, in this brief way, a field of work in colonial history that is practically unoccupied, and which eventually would yield rich results if cultivated by skillful hands. The amount of time required to do this work will depend, in part, upon the age of the pupil and the skill of the teacher. If but one year is spent upon the Sense phase of the work, then two years, at an age, say, from seven to nine, may profitably be given to the story in this form.

The Story of the Real Historical Person. — While the pupil has been enriching his imagination, for a year or so, by work after the kind indicated above, he has been extending his observation upon men and institutions and has been gathering that strength which inevitably follows an increase in years. He is then stronger from age, from experience, and from the possession of much historical material. In the order of the difficulty next comes the second form of historical story, the one in which the material is grouped around a real historical figure, — the man of flesh and blood. This is hero study still, but of a little different sort. The hero now is a man, or at least soon grows to be one. The facts and events will, therefore, present life in its sterner aspects. Where shall we find our heroes, and who shall they be? In this aspect of the work, the teacher will be overwhelmed with the abundance

of the material. From Columbus to the Columbian Exposition the heroes and heroines are abundant. Here is a partial list which may be suggestive as to what is possible in this field.

Discoveries and Settlements.

1. Columbus and the Finding of America.
2. Americus and the Naming of America.
3. Cortez, the Conqueror of Mexico.
4. Champlain, the Father of New France.
5. La Salle.
6. Marquette.
7. Joliet.
8. Henry Hudson and the *Half Moon.*
9. John Cabot, who first saw the Continent.
10. Sir Francis Drake, who sailed the Spanish Main.
11. Sir Walter Raleigh, who tried to plant a Colony.
12. Captain John Smith, the Founder of Jamestown.
13. Pocahontas, the Indian Queen.
14. Captain Miles Standish, the Pilgrim Soldier.
15. Squanto and Samoset, the good Indians.
16. Winthrop, the long-time Governor of Massachusetts.
17. Roger Williams, the Founder of Rhode Island and the Friend of Massachusetts.
18. King Philip, the bad Indian.
19. Captain Kidd, the Pirate.
20. Peter Stuyvesant and the Defence of New Amsterdam.
21. Nathaniel Bacon and his Men.
22. William Penn and the Great Treaty.
23. Governor Andros, the Tyrant of New England.

The Period of Revolution.

1. General Montcalm, the Defender of Canada.
2. General Wolfe, the Hero of Quebec.
3. George Washington, the Undaunted.
4. Nathaniel Greene, the Strategist of the Revolution.
5. General Stark and his Green Mountain Boys.
6. Israel Putnam and the News from Lexington.
7. Daniel Morgan and his Sharpshooters.
8. Mad Anthony Wayne and the Storming of Stony Point.
9. Francis Marion, the Swamp Fox.
10. General Herkimer and the Relief of Fort Stanwix.
11. Paul Jones and his great Sea Fight.
12. Paul Revere, the Courier of the Revolution.
13. Daniel Boone, the Pioneer of Kentucky.
14. George Rogers Clark and the Campaign against Vincennes.
15. Samuel Adams, the Firebrand of the Revolution.
16. Patrick Henry, the Orator of the Revolution.
17. Benjamin Franklin and his old brown Coat.
18. La Fayette, the Friend of Washington and America.
19. Light Horse Harry, the Cavalry Captain.
20. Jennie McCrea and Burgoyne's Allies.
21. How Colonel Washington made his Mark at the Battle of Cowpens.
22. Robert Morris, the Financier of the Revolution.

The Ethical Value of Studying Historical Persons.— This stage of work can be made to yield some valuable pedagogical results, so far as the spiritual life of the child is concerned. In the discussions upon the educational value of interpretation and other logical processes, we saw a peculiar ethical value resulting from a study of motives to action

in men, parties, and nations. But in the work described above there is added another element, namely, admiration for that which is heroic. No more powerful formative influence can take hold on the heart and mind of the pupil than a splendid heroic character. The life of the child grows toward the life he studies and admires. He will consciously strive to realize in his own conduct what attracts him in the conduct of his hero. If the admiration is strong, the pupil may look upon all his acts — good or bad — as worthy of imitation. No doubt the unconscious influence of such study is even greater than the conscious. It reaches into the life of the pupil in a way that eludes the teacher and parent, — both wonder where certain opinions and actions originate without being able to discover the cause; even the pupil cannot explain it, for he is not conscious in many instances of following any one in his conduct.

Hero worship partly explains the attraction which youthful minds find in the cheap novel. Surely, the teacher should be as wise as the novelist, and may be wiser than some novelists, for in a measure the teacher may select the characters presented for study and moral guidance. In making this selection the teacher will be guided by the ethical welfare of the pupil, and will certainly not feed the young imagination and emotions upon abnormal examples of either goodness or wickedness; and while it is no doubt wise that gentle, generous, noble, self-sacrificing, and patriotic characters should constitute the predominant themes for study, yet it remains true that real life for which

the pupil is preparing will present many characters just the opposite of what it is possible to select for him from the pages of history. In the affairs of life it will be just as necessary for his own good and that of his country that he should courageously condemn the low and base as praise the noble and brave.

Can hero study be made to stimulate not only admiration for the good, but condemnation for the bad? In two ways, it seems to me, this result may be reached. First, by watching a hero in his struggle against the wrong. This increases admiration for the hero. Second, by presenting the opposite sort of hero now and then, so that the pupil's hatred for cowards, traitors, thieves, and self-seekers may be strengthened, and his appreciation of the noble qualities of men may be stronger by seeing the evil results that flow from men of opposite character. Under certain limitations ignoble conduct excites greater respect and admiration for its opposite, and may cause the pupil to resolve to avoid it, and practice, and otherwise promote, the positive virtues. This can be successfully accomplished by the wise leadings of the teacher. Not much of the interpretation of the conduct of noble characters is necessary, for their lives speak a language directly to the heart; but the negative character, like Arnold or General Charles Lee, must be handled with more care. Their lives illustrate how persons of great ability in high places may be dominated by selfish ends and bring great injury upon themselves, their friends, and their country. But too many such cases weaken the pupil's faith in human nature, — a most disas-

trous result, as far as the pupil is concerned. For this reason, as well as for the truth of history, the teachers must see that the positive rather than the negative hero occupies the greater share of this portion of history work.

The Story Side of the Event. — This represents the third form of the historical story and also the third phase of Representative history. It has been remarked, in other connections, that events have a sensuous side which lends itself to reproduction in imagination. The picturable incidents of an event furnish the material for weaving about it a story. The age and experience[1] of the pupil — say, from ten to fourteen — permit an interest in the panorama of the event for its own sake. There will not be the same need of leaning upon an ideal or real historical person as before. However, the transition from the second story form to the third should be gradual. The transition may be easy and natural, for the real historical personage participates in events, and it becomes only a transfer of emphasis from one element in the moving scene to another.

There is no need of repeating here what has been said about the possibility of reproducing events — picturing them in imagination. It may not be amiss to say that some features of events yield themselves more readily to reproduction than others; in general, those which appeal

[1] Even if the pupil has not had the preliminary training in the other forms of the story, yet he has been gaining some from reading and much from observing the movements of events around him.

to the eye, attract the ear, and touch the feelings of the observer are the ones most susceptible of vivid reproduction. This general rule may be pretty safely followed in the preparation of a story, if it be constantly remembered that events and their various features are so many signs of thoughts and feelings.

Immediately, with respect to knowledge, one object in view is to give the pupil possession of the picture side of the leading events of American history, so that he may know how American history appeared to the people who made it, and at the same time have some appreciation of their thoughts and feelings. Pictures of events may not be a high form of historical knowledge, but they certainly do enrich the mind of the possessor. They give to it not only richness of imagery, but a variety that confers life and elasticity. The very presence of imaged events must make the mind vastly more fertile than it would otherwise be, and will give it the power of self-employment and self-entertainment. There is a vast difference between young persons who have abundant mental resources and those whose minds are empty. To give the young people the power to call up in brilliant and imposing review the procession of events from the beginning of American history to the present is a task worthy of the highest pedagogical skill, especially when one thinks of the consequences which may flow from it.

At the beginning of this form of the story, emphasis is put on the picturable side of events; but the study of their meaning must not be neglected. Although the pupil

is able to get more picture than meaning, yet he must get all of the latter his ability will allow. The simpler forms of thought and sentiment of individuals and groups are now possible to him and will add interest and value to the work. However, as the pupil moves through this field, the teacher should gradually shift the emphasis to the side of the event's content till this feature dominates the work. The transition should be so gradual as to be unconscious to the pupil and in no way diminish his efforts in gathering picturable material for the recitation. The lessons may still be assigned in terms of the external features of the event, while the recitation should call for the event's simpler relations and significance.

On the side of mind, the immediate purpose of this sort of story-making is to train the imagination — to give it power and facility in performing its functions. No richer opportunity of cultivating the sensuous imagination will ever come to the pupil; no other subject will furnish it more exercise than this phase of history.

Remotely, the purpose here is to prepare for the beginnings of that form of history work in which the processes and products of the understanding are the characteristic features. This portion of the Story side of history forms a natural transition to the reflective or logical phase. In the first place, it deals with the same individual facts and events ; and, in the second place, the action of the judgment in the form of inference comes into play as a constantly growing factor. The remarks already made concerning the dependence of the advanced form of history work upon the

picture form of it had particular reference to the picture side of the event. Both the unfolding mental life of the pupil and the relation of dependence between the phases of history work demand that the teacher shall look beyond this particular form to that higher toward which the pupil is moving, and that the present work shall be constantly modified to meet these more remote ends. It requires little effort to see the great gain to the pupil who has covered the leading events of American history in this way when he comes to the more thoughtful work.

There need be little discussion as to where appropriate material is to be found. It is abundant all along the way, from Columbus to our day. It will be safe generally to follow the order of events as presented in some good text on American history. While the sequence of events is now to have weight, yet the teacher is not to try to cover each of the events by a story, but rather is to make a selection of events determined partly by their importance and partly by the ease with which the facts permit of this kind of treatment. But so far as the materials for the story are concerned, the ordinary text furnishes little more than a dry outline. In most cases it is not adapted to this sort of work. Generally it is a skeleton narrative, while it ought to be narrative-descriptive, not only exhibiting to the imagination interesting movements of men and events, but also presenting an abundance of concrete acts and other details, which reveal, to some extent, the thoughts and feelings behind them. On the other hand, it is no uncommon mistake for history text-books to do too much for

the pupil[1] by giving what he ought to discover by interpretation. The pupil is thus deprived of his right to think out for himself what he is easily capable of doing, and what he must be allowed to do, if he is to get growth out of this subject. Instead of permitting independent effort, the text-book often gives him a ready-made solution, as would be said in arithmetic, and his only apparent work is to memorize it and give it back to the teacher in the memorized and unassimilated form. Such a text-book deprives the teacher of the opportunity of testing her skill in setting problems in history to the pupil. Lacking this stimulus, she assigns the lesson in terms of paragraphs and pages instead of content. Of course, this may be avoided if the teacher makes her own story of the event.

Illustrations of Material and Method of Work. — An example of the Story side of the event will explain more fully the nature and purpose of this transitional phase, and at the same time illustrate the method to be employed. Let us take the Boston Tea Party. This presupposes that the pupil has dealt in like manner with the Stamp Act, the Congress of 1765, the Boston Massacre, and other related acts. We want the pupil to look, as it were, on the Boston Tea Party, and see it just as it occurred. If the teacher has the power to make him feel the jostle of the crowd and hear the voices of the multitude so vividly that he loses himself for the time being, so much the better.

Early one morning, in the middle of December, 1773, on

[1] A truer statement of this defect is that the text-book does too little for the pupil by doing too much for him.

all the roads leading to Boston, for a distance of twenty miles around, were to be seen men singly and in groups making their way to town. Let us look at these people. They are engaged in earnest conversation; some of them speak loudly, and shake their heads and fists. As the distance grows shorter, people are seen on foot; the numbers increase till it seems that all the country villages are emptying their people, on that cold day, into Boston. As these two thousand country and village people approach the city they find it all astir; the shops and stores are closed; men are gathered in groups discussing the question whether the tea shall be landed or not; messengers are running to and fro over the city, and a general movement toward the "Old South Meeting-House" is noticed. There, at ten o'clock, the vast crowd assembles to hear the answer of the owner of one of the vessels, whether he will take his cargo of hated tea back to England. The meeting organizes by the election of a Moderator, and Mr. Rotch, the vessel owner, tells the meeting that the collector of the port refuses to let him go back with his tea; the meeting then orders him to hurry to the governor and get his permission to pass by the guns of Castle William. While the anxious owner goes in search of the governor, who has gone away to his country seat to avoid the crowds, the great mass meeting adjourns till the afternoon.

At three o'clock, it seemed that all the town tried to get into the "Old South Meeting-House," crowding its seats and galleries, standing in its aisles and around the entrance, —seven thousand people tried to hear and see what was

said and done. The meeting comes to order, hears patriotic speeches, and passes resolutions not to allow the tea to be landed. Great enthusiasm is excited when one speaker asks "how tea would taste in salt water," and another said: "Now the hand is to the plough, there must be no looking back." Closest attention is given to the earnest advice of Josiah Quincy, as he counsels moderation and prophesies of the great struggle near at hand. Samuel Adams, of course, was listened to in that winter's afternoon. Night comes on and lights are brought in, but no answer is at hand from the governor, and yet the people wait. There was a feeling "as the cold night darkened without, that the last scene was about to be enacted." At 6.15 Rotch came in and told the breathless audience that the governor would not let the tea go back. The people began to murmur against Rotch, but Samuel Adams arose and said: "This meeting can do nothing more to save the country." This seemed to be a signal, for immediately the war-whoop of the "Mohawks" startled the audience; it was answered from the galleries; the whole audience now shouts its approval, and pours itself out into the streets and noisily follows the "Mohawks" to the wharf and there witnesses their work. See the Indians clamber over the sides of the vessel; whooping and brandishing their tomahawks, they rush down to the hold and up come the boxes of tea — two hundred and forty of them — which are thrown into the sea. The work was hardly done before the swift couriers were hastening with the news to leading Massachusetts towns. All New England was thrilled by the

news as it sped by one means or another from province to province. On the next day, Paul Revere, the courier of the Revolution, rode away to New York and Philadelphia to carry the tidings of that day's work. At every farm-house, village, or city he told the story. There was great rejoicing, ringing of bells, bonfires, speeches, toasts,— and all in honor of the patriots of Boston. Philadelphia had two meetings in celebration of the event, and the last one, attended by five thousand people, sent a formal vote of thanks to the Bostonians. The news was carried far to the southward, and even from the Carolinas came back words of approbation and good will.

After a fashion, the above paragraph indicates the kind of pictures the pupil should find in a text-book or in the teacher's stories adapted to this stage of history work. What shall the pupil do with this sort of material? In the first place, he should not commit the language. In the second place, if the teacher wishes the pupil to solve the problem before the recitation, then the lesson will be assigned in terms of the thoughts and feelings of the people; while, if the teacher wishes the solution to be thought out in the class, the lesson will be assigned in terms of the picture. To accomplish the latter purpose, the teacher assigns the lesson about as follows: 1. Read over the story of the Tea Party till you can see, with your eyes shut, the acts of the people from beginning to end. 2. Tell the number of great scenes in the picture, and describe the acts of the people in each great scene. These directions will prepare the pupil for the real struggle that

is to take place in the recitation, — the passing by inference from the deeds of the people to their thoughts and feelings. But if the former plan is pursued, the directions may take a form like the following: 1. What conclusions can you draw from seeing so many country people on their way to Boston at the same time? Prove your answer from their acts. 2. How were the people of the town feeling over the question of the tea? Give reasons. 3. What is the meaning of the meeting of the country and town people all together, hearing and applauding the same speeches, voting the same resolutions, and participating in the destruction of the tea? 4. Did not the persons who destroyed the tea feel guilty of wrong-doing? Prove your answer. 5. Why was the news carried so quickly to the Massachusetts and other New England towns? 6. Why was Paul Revere sent to New York and Philadelphia with the news of the Tea Party, and what is the meaning of the responses that greeted him and the people of Boston? 7. Did the governor of Massachusetts agree with the people? Prove the answer. 8. What do you infer as to the effect of the work of the Tea Party on England? Why?

These questions, or others of a similar import, should be put to the class before or during the recitation. If used in assigning the lesson, they will force the pupil to go through the language to the ideas expressed — will force him to go down below the surface play of events into the hearts and minds of the people. This would cause the pupil to study and re-study the story of the event, and would, no doubt, leave him in possession of as full a picture of the

scene as if the lesson had been assigned in terms of the picture. How many of these questions can the pupil answer? Nearly, if not quite, all of them. How many can he find formally answered in the above sketch? He should find none, or at most a very small number. Suppose the text should indicate somewhat in detail the answers to these questions. What difference would it make to the pupil? All the difference between the work of an active sharpened judgment and the monotonous grind of the memory! Why not give the pupil an opportunity to think a little in history?

It will be noted that in this transition phase attention is being directed to the content of the acts put forth. Now, while this is still Story work, yet the work of stimulating the historical judgment must be kept in mind and must become more and more prominent as the student grows stronger through discipline and knowledge.

One more illustration will be given, — somewhat more difficult, and taken from the text of Montgomery's *Leading Facts of American History*. This will serve to show how the teacher may use the material found in certain text-books and adapt it to this phase of the work.

"General Gage, having learned that the colonists had stored a quantity of powder and provisions for the use of their militia, at Concord, about twenty miles from Boston, sent a secret expedition to destroy both. The soldiers were instructed to go by way of Lexington, and there arrest Samuel Adams and John Hancock, who were known to be stopping with a friend in that village. The London papers boasted that the heads of these two prominent

'rebels' would soon be on exhibition in that city; but, as Gage found out, Adams and Hancock were not the kind of men to lose their heads so easily.

"The British troops left Boston just before midnight of April 18, 1775. Paul Revere, a noted Boston patriot, was on the watch, and as soon as he saw his friends' signal lanterns hung out in the steeple of the Old North Church, — a church still standing, — he galloped through the country giving the alarm. When he reached the house in Lexington where Hancock and Adams were asleep, a man on guard cried out to him, 'Don't make so much noise.' 'Noise!' shouted Revere; 'you 'll have noise enough before long: the "regulars" are coming.'

"Just before daybreak of April 19, the 'regulars' marched on to the village green of Lexington, where a number of 'minute men' had collected. 'Disperse, ye rebels,' shouted Pitcairn, the British commander. No one moved; then Pitcairn cried, 'Fire!' A volley blazed out, and seven Americans fell dead. Advancing to Concord, the soldiers destroyed such military stores as they could find; at Concord Bridge they were met by the patriots. Both fired; it was the true opening battle of the Revolution, — several men fell on each side. There the first British blood was shed; there the first British graves were dug. The 'regulars' then drew back, leaving the Americans in possession of the bridge, and began their march toward Boston.

"But the whole country was now aroused. The enraged farmers fired at the British from behind every wall, bush, and tree. The march became a retreat, the retreat some-

thing like a run. When the 'regulars' got back to Lexington, where Lord Percy met them with reënforcements, they dropped panting on the ground, their tongues hanging out like those of tired dogs. From Lexington the 'minute men' chased the British all the way to Charlestown. Nearly three hundred of the 'red-coats,' as the Americans nicknamed the English soldiers, lay dead or dying on the road.

"Percy had marched gaily out of Boston to the tune of 'Yankee Doodle,' played in ridicule of the Americans, but it was noticed that his band did not play it on reentering the town — they had had quite enough of all that was 'Yankee' for that day.

"The next morning the British army found themselves shut up in Boston. The Americans had surrounded the town on the land side, and in future no expedition could leave it in that direction without a fight. The siege of Boston had begun."

The lesson on this may be assigned with reference to two ends: picturing clearly and vividly the scenes enacted, and interpreting the scenes, — getting into the minds and hearts of the contestants.

If the class have not heard or read this story before, then the first lesson ought to be assigned in terms of the picture. Some directions like the following may be used: 1. Read over the lesson till you can see all the movements from Boston to Concord and back again. 2. Picture Paul Revere on the watch — tell what you would have seen had you stood by. 3. Go with Paul Revere as he alarmed the

country, and tell what he did and said, what the people — fathers, sons, mothers, children — did and said, and whatever else might have been seen and heard that night. 4. Picture the skirmish on Lexington Green and at Concord Bridge. 5. Work out all the features of the retreat to Lexington. 6. What did the Yankee boys see and hear who hid behind the stone walls and watched the minute men chase the regulars from Lexington to Charlestown? 7. What differences did General Gage see between the British soldiers as they marched out and as they returned? 8. What do you see in and around Boston the next day? Other elements of the picture may be brought out by questions formulated to suit the case.

While the narration and description of events given above are better adapted to this form of study than that given by most texts of this grade, yet it is very desirable that the teacher suggest to the pupil the necessity of enriching certain scenes by reading other and fuller accounts. By this means, different members of the class will be able to contribute different details to the pictures; two gains will be made, — fuller pictures and the habit of looking further than the text for facts.

If the pupil, for any reason, can do more and stronger work than the above questions call for, the teacher may in addition require an interpretation of the acts pictured, as far as the pupil's ability will permit. The following questions and directions will illustrate what is meant: 1. What was the purpose of both English and Americans with reference to this expedition? Prove your answer from the

text and from the acts of the participants. 2. Which party changed its purpose? Prove by citing facts. 3. What conclusions do you reach from the fact that the expedition was intended to be secret and yet was watched? What other facts support your conclusions? 4. What were the feelings of the people when Paul Revere aroused them out of their sleep? Why do you think so? 5. Could Paul Revere alone have aroused enough farmers to defeat the British? What inferences, then, are safe to make? 6. Contrast the thoughts and feelings of the British regulars on leaving Boston with their thoughts and feelings on returning. Give reasons.

It ought to be clear that no memorizing of the text of the above account can meet the requirements indicated by the above questions and directions. In truth, the pupil would never be tempted to memorize words if it were not for the teacher. The teacher, by her assignment of work and method of conducting the recitation, forces the pupil to commit the language of the text. No normal child takes pleasure in this unless it is found to be the easiest way of "getting the lesson." The illustrations given will indicate the method to be followed to break up the habit when once formed, as well as to prevent its formation.

It is hardly necessary to draw the contrast between this method of dealing with events and the method usually followed. Tried by any standard, one merits commendation and the other condemnation. What if the pupil had two years of this work, — touching the leading events of American history, — as a preparation for the organization

of that history into such a system as has been indicated in the first part of this work? Certainly he would be in a position to begin earlier than is usual the work of organizing the material of history in the form of a system. This would also relieve him of the task of gathering the new material of the subject, while he ought to be expending all his energies in interpretation and other organizing processes.

We have now come full around again to the last phase of history study, — that phase in which the student's knowledge ends and the teacher's knowledge begins.

HISTORY BOOKS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

Primary Grades.

1. Ten Boys on the Road from Long Ago to Now. *Ginn & Co.*
2. Stories of Heroic Deeds. *American Book Co.*
3. Swiss Family Robinson. *Ginn & Co.*
4. Pilgrims and Puritans. *Ginn & Co.*
5. Ten Great Events in History. *American Book Co.*
6. Stories of Our Country. *American Book Co.*
7. Eggleston's History of the United States. *American Book Co.*
8. Gilman's Discovery and Exploration of America. *Inter-State Pub. Co.*
9. Gilman's Colonization of America. *Inter-State Pub. Co.*
10. Gilman's Making of the American Nation. *Inter-State Pub. Co.*
11. Grandfather's Stories. *American Book Co.*
12. American History Stories, Nos. 1–4. *I. N. Harlan* (*Indianapolis*).
13. Pioneer History Stories. First Series. *Public School Pub. Co.*
14. Glasscock's Stories of Columbia. *D. Appleton & Co.*
15. Pierson's History of the United States (One Syllable). *Geo. Routledge & Sons.*
16. Pierson's Lives of the Presidents (One Syllable). *Geo. Routledge & Sons.*

Grammar Grades.

1. Pratt's American History Stories, Nos. 1–4. *Educational Pub. Co.*
2. Pratt's Columbus. *Educational Pub. Co.*
3. Pratt's Pizarro. *Educational Pub. Co.*
4. Pratt's Cortez and Montezuma. *Educational Pub. Co.*
5. Pratt's Great West. *Educational Pub. Co.*
6. Pratt's Stories of Massachusetts. *Educational Pub. Co.*
7. Children's Stories of Adventure and Discovery.
8. Children's Stories of American Progress.
9. Poor Boys who have become Famous.
10. Sewell's Paul Jones.
11. Higginson's Young Folks' History of the United States. *Lee & Shepard.*
12. Butterworth's Young Folks' History of America. *Lothrop & Co.*
13. Coffin's Building of the Nation. *Harper & Bros.*
14. Coffin's Boys of '76. *Harper & Bros.*
15. Coffin's Boys of '61. *Harper & Bros.*
16. Coffin's Old Times in the Colonies. *Harper & Bros.*
17. Coffin's Nights on the Battlefield. *Estes & Lauriat.*
18. Hawthorne's Grandfather's Chair. *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*
19. Page's Two Little Confederates.
20. From Colony to Commonwealth. *Ginn & Co.*
21. Fiske's War for Independence. *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*
22. Brooks' Historic Boys. *Putnam's Sons.*
23. Brooks' Historic Girls. *Putnam's Sons.*
24. Abbott's Peter Stuyvesant. *Dodd, Mead & Co.*
25. Abbott's Paul Jones. *Dodd, Mead & Co.*
26. Abbott's Daniel Boone. *Dodd, Mead & Co.*

27. Scudder's Boston Town. *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*
28. Rolfe's Tales from English History. *Harper & Bros.*
29. Rolfe's Tales from Scottish History. *Harper & Bros.*
30. Rolfe's Tales from Chivalry. *Harper & Bros.*
31. Washington and His Country. *Ginn & Co.*
32. Chivalric Days. *Putnam's Sons.*
33. With Lee in Virginia. *Scribner's Sons.*
34. Scudder's George Washington. *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

LEADING FACTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

By D. H. MONTGOMERY

12mo. Cloth. xii + 406 + 82 pages. With full maps, both black and in color, illustrations, etc. List price, $1.00; mailing price, $1.15

MR. MONTGOMERY'S "American History" is undeniably the most popular and most successful text for schools now published. This commanding position is owing to its combination of a fascinating style, scholarly accuracy, emphasis of reasons for events, and a discriminating appreciation of what are the vital facts in the history of the United States.

The book arouses enthusiasm wherever it is used. Its simple, narrative style appeals at once to the pupil who has been led to believe that history consists of obstinate dates and easily forgotten facts. It has to do with essentials, — the leading facts of the subject.

The latest impression of the work includes an account of the accession of President Roosevelt, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, an elaborate bibliography, questions for examination, a topical analysis of the entire subject, valuable maps and illustrations, and much other matter of great value to the teacher and the pupil.

Either the "Beginner's American History" or the "Elementary American History," together with the "Leading Facts of American History," provides a complete course for grammar schools.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

AN ELEMENTARY AMERICAN HISTORY

By D. H. MONTGOMERY

12mo. Cloth. 306 + xlii pages. With maps and illustrations. List price, 75 cents; mailing price, 85 cents

For many schools the "Elementary American History" will be found sufficiently complete for a one-book course in the subject. Together with the author's "Leading Facts of American History" it forms a complete course for the grammar grades.

MR. MONTGOMERY has prepared this little book to meet the demand for a brief, continuous narrative history of our country suited to the wants of elementary pupils. It begins with the earliest accounts of the discovery of America and comes down to the present time. Throughout the work the attention of the pupil is constantly directed to those events which are of primary interest and importance. Whenever such events have been shaped by the action of some well-known man, the writer has endeavored to show the part which that man contributed. By this means the book is made living and real even to the youngest student of its pages.

As in the author's "Beginner's American History," every prominent topic has been carefully and fully illustrated with appropriate pictures or maps, in order that the book may appeal to the eye as well as to the understanding.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU, Boston

107869

Author Mace, William H

Title Method in history.

Educat
Teach
M